

RESEARCHES IN SANSKRIT AND INDOLOGY

Vol. II

Classical Sanskrit Literature

Satya Vrat Shastri

YASH PUBLICATIONS

CC-0. Prof. Satya Vrat Shastri Collection, New Delhi. Digitized by S3 Foundation USA

RESEARCHES IN SANSKRIT AND INDOLOGY

Vol. II

Classical Sanskrit Literature

Satya Vrat Shastri

HONORARY PROFESSOR, SPECIAL CENTRE FOR SANSKRIT STUDIES

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

FORMERLY PROFESSOR AND HEAD, DEPARTMENT OF SANSKRIT

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

EX-VICE-CHANCELLOR,

SHRI JAGANNATH SANSKRIT UNIVERSITY, PURI (ORISA)

YASH PUBLICATIONS

Delhi

Satya Vrat Shastri
Published in India, 2005

ISBN : 81-.....

© Satya Vrat Shastri

Price : Rs.

All Rights Reserved

Published by
YASH PUBLICATIONS
1/10753, Street No. 3, Subhash Park,
Naveen Shahdara, Delhi-32
Ph. 011-22822514
Email : yash_publication@hotmail.com

Printed at :
Nagri Printers
Naveen Shahdara, Delhi-110032

Contents

1. Mahimabhaṭṭa's Criticism of the Concept of Dhvani.....	1
2. Kāruṇa Rasa in Sanskrit Literature	3
3. Jaina Meghadūta of Meruṭuṅga	13
4. Indudūta of Vinaya Vijayaṅgaṇi : A Textual Study	19
5. A Critical Survey of Sanskrit Dūtakāvyas	29
6. The Anyoktis in the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa	75
7. Conception of Time in Post-Vedic Sanskrit Literature	85
8. Kālidāsa's Ṛṣis	110
9. The Kumārasambhava - Its Genuine Portion.....	131
10. Sanskrit Language and Literature : A Study in Envi- ronment	135
11. The Date of the Yogavāsiṣṭha	147
12. The Plan of the Yogavāsiṣṭha	167
13. Descriptive Poetry in the Yogavāsiṣṭha	171
14. The Anyoktis in the Yogavāsiṣṭha.....	181
15. Contribution of the Muslims to Sanskrit in Medieval Period.....	191
16. Some Peripheral Literature : Lexicography and Medicine.....	206
17. संस्कृतसाहित्ये हास्यरसः	215
18. काव्य प्रयोजन विचार	219
19. वामनपुराण में काव्यच्छटा	227

Sat
Pul

ISE

©

Pr

Al

Pl
Y,
1/
Ni
Pl
E

F
M
I

Mahimabhaṭṭa's Criticism of the Concept of Dhvani

Though the concept of Dhvani had made wide acceptance at the hands of Ālaṅkārikas, there have been some, they are however far smaller in number, who have voiced their opposition to it. Rājānaka Mahimabhaṭṭa is one of them. In the first chapter of his *Vyaktiviveka* he devotes considerable space to the criticism of Dhvani and the enunciation of his view which regards it as redundant; the purpose of it being adequately served through the primary power of Denotation, Abhidhā. Mahimabhaṭṭa is Abhidhāvādin. His view may be briefly set forth as follows: There is no power in a word except Abhidhā. Lakṣaṇā resides in the sense and not in the word. In the expression *gaur vahikah*, the identification between the ox and the resident of Vāhikas is known through inference, *anumāna*. Similarly is known the situation of a hamlet on the bank of the river Gaṅgā on account of the impossibility of its being located on the flowing current of water. This inference, *anumiti*, according to him, is different from the *anumiti*, inference, of the Naiyāyikas; it is *kāvyānumiti*. Suggestion being a secondary sense comes within the purview of the *kāvyānumiti*. In expression where secondary sense is understood it is not due to suggestion; it is due to *kāvyānumiti*. Now all these are familiar points of criticism. There is, however, one point where Mahimabhaṭṭa's criticism of the Dhvani School is characterized by freshness of approach. He tries to cut at the very root of it. It is maintained by the Ālaṅkārikas that the use of the word Dhvani on their part is inspired by the similarity of its function in the Vyākaraṇaśāstra, *vyāñjakatvasāmyāt*.¹ In the Vyākaraṇaśāstra the relationship between Dhvani and Spota is that of *vyāñjaka*, manifestor, and *vyāngya*, manifested. This relationship is similar to the one between *ghaṭa* and *pradīpa*, the jar and the lamp. Just as a lamp manifests a jar but while

manifesting it manifests itself too similarly does Dhvani manifest Sphoṭa while manifesting itself too. In other words between Dhvani and Sphoṭa there is the relationship of *yaugapadya*, simultaneity. That is the import of the *ghaṭapradīpanyāya*. It is at this Mahimabhaṭṭa has launched his attack. There is no simultaneity here. There is sequence here too. Says he :

अत एव (क्रमस्य सुलक्षत्वात्) श्रूयमाणानां शब्दानां ध्वनिव्यपदेशानामन्तः
सन्निवेशिनश्च स्फोटाभिमतस्यार्थस्य व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकभावो न सम्भवतीति
व्यञ्जकत्वसाम्याच्चः शब्दार्थमिति काव्ये ध्वनिव्यपदेशः साऽप्यनुपपन्नः

The moment the concept of *yaugapadya*, simultaneity, is taken out, the whole concept of Dhvani, based as it is on the similarity of function of Dhvani in Vyākaraṇa and Alāṅkāraśāstras, falls. If in the Vyākaraṇaśāstra it can be shown that there is no relationship of *vyañjaka* and *vyaṅgya* between Dhvani and Sphoṭa which would mean that Dhvani is not *vyañjaka*, the use of the word Dhvani in Alāṅkāraśāstra on the similarity of its function in Vyākaraṇaśāstra, *vyañjakatva-sāmyād*, would lose its point. With the sequence, *krama*, existing in Dhvani and Sphoṭa they evidently cannot stand in the relationship of *vyañjaka* and *vyaṅgya*; they would instead have to stand in the relationship of *gamaka* and *gamyā*. If we accept Dhvani as *gamaka* or *anumāpaka* in Vyākaraṇaśāstra we shall have to accept it as such in Alāṅkāraśāstra. In that case Dhvani will lose its *raison de etre* and would come to be identified with *anumiti* (*dhvaner anumitāṁ antarbhāvah*). Now this is a criticism which is of far reaching significance not only for the Ālāṅkārikas but also for the Vyaiyākaraṇas who have all along accepted the relationship of *vyañjaka* and *vyaṅgya* between Dhvani and Sphoṭa. With his informed criticism Mahimabhaṭṭa has created a problem for the rhetoricians and the grammarians.

References

1. 'बुधैवैयाकरणैः प्रधानभूतस्फोटरूपव्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकस्य शब्दस्य ध्वनिरिति व्यवहारः कृतः। ततस्तन्मतानुसारिभिरन्यैरपि न्यग्भाविताव्यव्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जनक्षमस्य शब्दार्थयुगलस्य।

Kāvyaaprakāśa, I. 4.

2. *Vyaktiviveka*, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1936, p.

Karuṇa Rasa in Sanskrit Literature

The entire creation is made up of opposites : द्वन्द्वत्मिका सृष्टिः. One of these opposites is happiness and sorrow. Both are interrelated. There can be no happiness without sorrow. The happiness presupposes the existence of sorrow. If it were not so, the very realization of happiness would not be possible.

It is the peculiarity of poetry that whatever produces unhappiness in real life comes to produce in poetry happiness or joy. Poetry imparts the character of *alaukikatva* to the day to day experience of life. Their description at the hands of the poet elevates them to a state where they cease to be the ordinary day to day experiences. In poetry they assume a peculiar form which enables them to provide joy to readers or listeners. That is the spirit of Rasa that had been grasped by the thinkers and critics centuries past. Among human beings there are certain permanent emotions which are given the name of Sthāyibhāvās. It is these when bestirred by certain phenomena turn into Rasas and come to be relished or enjoyed. Of all the Rasas, Karuṇa or Pathos touches the heart quick, pierces the vitals, gives out a jolt. In Erotic there is a kind of serenity. In Heroic the enthusiasm dominates. In Fierce and Terrible it is the fear which grips but it is in Pathos, Karuṇa that heart melts : प्रायः सर्वो भवति करुणावृत्तिराद्रान्ति रात्मा' The mind is shattered : भवति मनोभङ्गः. The limbs sink : सीदन्ति गात्राणि. Interestingly the literal meaning of the word विषाद is sinking. It is natural for human beings to avoid such situations, to get over them. This is what explains the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit. With all bad situations, the sorrows and sufferings, one comes out at the end, happy and contented. That further explains as to why in the entire corpus of Sanskrit literature there are few works which have Karuṇa as the principal sentiment even though they have powerful content of it in certain situations. The idea is that one may not have to remain

in perpetual state of despondency and melancholy or that the state of despondency or melancholy are not to be taken to undermine the very fibre of a person.

While eumerating the number of Rasas Bharata gives the third place to Karuṇa. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* mentions eight Rasas, such as :

शृङ्गारहास्यकरुणारौद्रवीरभयानकाः।
बीभत्सान्द्रतसंप्रज्ञौ चेत्यष्टौ नादयै रसाः स्मृताः॥²

To these eight Rasas of Bharata, later poeticians like Udbhaṭa and others have added other Rasas like Śānta, Preyas and Bhakti. Viśvanātha has considered Vātsalya too as Rasa. But no poetician has ever changed the serial of the number of Rasas given by Bharata. Its position in the list of the Rasas shows its importance. The famous Rasa Sūtra of Bharata : विभावानुभाव संचारि संयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्ति³ propounds the whole process of aesthetic experience or *rasānubhūti*. For considering any Rasa its *Sthāyibhāva* is first to be taken into consideration.

In the case of Karuṇa it is Śoka which is its *Sthāyibhāva*:

रतिर्हासश्च शोकश्च क्रोधोत्साहौ भयं तथा।
जुगुप्सा विस्मयश्चेति स्थविभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः॥⁴

Explaining Śoka Viśvanātha mentions that when "the *citta* becomes despondent by the destruction of the cherished it becomes शोक—इष्टनाशादिभिश्चेतोवैकल्यं शोकशब्दभाक्⁵ As the *Sthāyī* is the destruction of the cherished, so we find the definition of Karuṇa incorporating the same *iṣṭanāśa* with one more addition of receiving the uncherished : इष्टनाशादनिष्टापत्तेः करुणाख्यो रसो भवेत्⁶ It is quite evident from this (definition) that Karuṇa is an experience of Pathos. The human life is full of it. This element of Pathos is further stressed when Viśvanātha assigns it the colour of *kapota* (pigeon), and mentions Yama as its presiding deity : धीरैः कपोतवर्णोऽयं कथितो यमदैवतः⁷ *Kapota* is taken as an ill omen. Yama is the god of death. Both in their association with Karuṇa lend it a sense of deprivation that a man experiences.

Here would arise a question as to whether Karuṇa can at all be called Rasa when it gives an experience of sorrow, for in that case it will counter the definition of Rasa which is explained as continuous happiness and is likened to the experience of

Brahman :

सत्त्वोद्रेकादखण्डस्वप्रकाशानन्दचिन्मयः।
वेद्यान्तरस्पर्शशून्यो ब्रह्मास्वादसहोदरः॥^९

To this the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* gives a fitting reply. According to it Rasa does not belong to empirical world, the pain of the empirical world is not to be experienced through it : लोकोत्तरचमत्कारप्राणः कैश्चित्प्रमातृभिः.^९ Viśvanātha maintains that the *sahṛdayas* realised happiness and not sorrow by experiencing Karuṇa etc.:

करुणादावपि रसे जायते यत्परं सुखम्।
सचेतसामनुभवः प्रमाणं तत्र केवलम्॥^{१०}

He further strengthens his argument by the logic that the people would not take to Karuṇa if they were not to derive pleasure out of it : किंच तेषु यदा दुःखं न कोऽपि स्यात्तदुन्मुखः.^{११} If that be otherwise, works like the *Rāmāyaṇa* would only bring unhappiness : तथा रामायणादीनां भवितुं दुःखहेतुता.^{१२} Thus, though Karuṇa means *iṣṭanāśā*, it gives the experience of the same aesthetic joy that is relished under other Rasas.

According to Sanskrit Poetics there is no wrong in depicting Karuṇa as the principal Rasa in a Kāvya. The *Sāhityadarpaṇa* holds the view that Karuṇa is the principal Rasa in the *Aṅka* form of Rūpakas and the *Ullāpya* form of Uparūpakas :

उत्सृष्टिकाङ्क्ष एकाङ्क्षो नेतारः प्राकृता नराः।
रसोऽत्र करुणः स्थायी बहुस्त्रीनरदेवितम्॥^{१३}
शिल्पिकाङ्क्षैर्युतं हास्यशृङ्गारकरुणै रसैः।
उल्लाप्यं बहुसङ्ग्रामसंगीतमनोहरम्॥^{१४}

Besides Vyāyoga and Īhāmṛga forms of Rūpakas also have Karuṇa as their principal Rasa as the *miśravṛtta* type of dramas.

But with all these possibilities for Karuṇa it does not take one long to notice that the Sanskrit literature does not have Kāvya or dramas which have Karuṇa as their principal Rasa, though the Greek literature is full of them. This may be traced to a principle maintained in Sanskrit Poetics that either Śṛṅgāra or Vira could be the principal Rasa in a poetic or dramatic composition.

एक एव भवेदङ्गी शृङ्गारो वीर एव वा।
अङ्गमन्ये रसाः सर्वे कार्या निर्वहणेऽद्भूतः॥¹⁵

But it does not mean that Karuṇa does not exist in Sanskrit works. Though in the later classical literature it is not made principal Rasa often, yet its existence can be traced right to the period of the Vedic literature. In the hymns of Vasiṣṭha to Varuṇa one marks its depiction :

किमाग आस वरुण ज्येष्ठं यत् स्तोतारं जिघांससि सखायम्।
प्र तन्मे वोचो दूळभस्वधास्वाव त्वानेना नमसा तुर इयाम्॥¹⁶

Vasiṣṭha here cries fervently to regain the favour of Varuṇa. The most eminent example of Karuṇa in earlier Sanskrit literature is the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Anandavardhana had rightly pointed out that in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the Karuṇa Rasa has been woven by declaring that sorrow has taken the turn of a stanza : रामायणे करुणो हि रसः—स्वयमादिकविना सूचितः शोकः श्लोकत्वमागत इत्येवमादिना.¹⁷

The *Rāmāyaṇa* mentions in the second canto of the Bālakāṇḍa that the first śloka uttered by Vālmīki came out of his śoka :

शोकार्तस्य प्रवृत्तो मे श्लोको भवतु नान्यथा.¹⁸

This has been noted by poets and scholars afterwards. Kālidāsa mentions in the *Raghuvamśa* that the śoka of Vālmīki became śloka after witnessing the sorrow of the crane :

निषादविद्धाण्डजदर्शितोऽथ श्लोकत्वमापद्यत यस्य शोकः॥¹⁹

Ānandavardhana echoes it when he says : क्रौञ्चद्वन्द्ववियोगोत्थः शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः.²⁰ In fact, Karuṇa underlies the whole story-structure of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the Ādikāvya of the Sanskrit literature. The very fact that the *Rāmāyaṇa* came into being out of the grief of a sensitive heart touched by the cries of the female companion of a bird pierced by an arrow of a hunter :

मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठां त्वमगमः शाश्वतीः समाः।

यत्क्रौञ्च मिथुनादेकमवधीः काममोहितम्॥²¹

shows the impact of Pathos. It is not an accident that one of the greatest of the creations of mankind had come into being out of shock : शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः True it is that “our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought.” The śoka of the *Rāmāyaṇa*

has remained a model for the later writers and one hears the echoes of the great epic in the later literature. More than half of the Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is full of *śoka* which finds its epitome in the writhing pain of Daśaratha at the exile of Rāma :

हा राघव महाबाहो हा ममायासनाशन।
हा पितृप्रिय मे नाथ हा ममासि गतः सुतः॥
हा कौसल्ये न पश्यामि हां सुमित्रे तपस्विनि।
हा नृशंसे ममामित्रे कैकेयि कुलपांसनि॥²²

The cry achieves the fineness of the highest Kāvya in Aranya Kāṇḍa where Rāma cries out for Sītā : न त्वहं त्वा विना सीते जीवेयं हि कथंचन and tells Lakṣmaṇa of his *śoka* :

सर्वं तु दुःखं मम लक्ष्मणेन शान्तं शरीरे वनमेत्य कोपम्।
सीतावियोगात् पुनरप्युदीर्णं काष्ठैरिवाग्निः सहसा प्रदीप्तः॥²³

Rāma's towering personality breaks down under the pressure of sorrow in losing Sītā and he cries out like an ordinary man :

नमद्विघ्नो दुष्कृतकर्मकारी मन्ये द्वितीयोऽस्ति वसुन्धरायाम्।
शोकानुशोको हि परम्पराया मामेति भिन्दन् हृदयं मनश्च॥²⁴

He becomes almost senseless and begins to enquire the whereabouts of Sītā from plants, animals and even the wind :

लोकेषु सर्वेषु न नास्ति किञ्चिद् यत्ते न नित्यं विदितं भवेत्तत्।
शंसस्व वायो कुलपालिनीं तां मृता हता वा पथि वर्तते वा॥²⁵

Karuṇa so minutely and elaborately described by Vālmīki in the *Rāmāyaṇa* achieves the highest pitch in the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti. The condition of remorseful Rāma burning within in sorrow on account of separation from Sītā whom he had himself banished is likened by him to *puṭapāka* (slow cooking within):

अनिर्भिन्नो गभीरत्वादन्तर्बुद्धिनवव्यथः।
पुटपाकप्रतीकाशो रामस्य करुणो रसः॥²⁷

Torn between his royal duties and attachment to his wife with whom he had spent the best years of his life, he represents a pathetic figure. Public calumny makes him forsake Sītā whom he knew to be as pure as any woman could be. She had well been tested of her purity in fire before his very eyes. To forsake

her required a sacrifice of him which reduced him in the process to a mental wreck. His duties he did though all the time haunted by the thoughts of his beloved. A visit to Pañcavaṭī put him back to old days of happy union with her. He was not able to stand that and fell into unconsciousness again and again invoking pity for him even in the heart of Sānumatī, the friend of Sitā who was following his movements invisible. All the misery, all the suffering Rāma was undergoing was his own doing. And that is what takes the Pathos in his character to the highest limit. Rightly is he made to say in the *Uttararāmacarita* : स्वयं कृत्वा त्यागं विलपनविनोदोऽप्यसुलभः.²⁸ In creating a character like Rāma and placing him in situations where he could have little sympathy for himself Bhavabhūti ascended heights in depicting Karuṇa achieved by very few in the entire range of Sanskrit literature prompting the critics to say : कारुण्यं भवभूतिरेव तनुते, Bhavabhūti alone can create Pathos.

In the *Rāmāyaṇa* Karuṇa is the principal Rasa, in the *Uttarāmacarita* it is the Rasa, other Rasas being just its different manifestations which get merged in it in their final existence :

एको रसः करुण एव निमित्तभेदाद भिन्नः पृथक् पृथगिवाश्रयते विवर्तान्²⁹

Bhavabhūti in his description has made even the stones cry and the rocks break :

अपि ग्रावा रोदित्यपि दलति वज्रस्य हृदयम्³⁰

The anguish of Rāma is best expressed when he tries to compose himself and says :

देव्या शून्यस्य जगतो द्वादशः परिवत्सरः।

प्रनष्टमिव नामापि न च रामो न जीवति।³¹

Besides the story of Rāma we find Karuṇa in the *Ūrubhaṅga* of Bhāsa where Duryodhana is shown crying in his death bed as he witnessess his helpless sons and widowed wives :

पूर्वं न जानामि गदाभिघातरुजामिदानीं तु समर्थयामि।

यन्मे प्रकाशीकृतमूर्धजानि रणं प्रविष्टान्यवरोधनानि।³²

One of the best examples of Karuṇa is found in the famous *Meghadūta* where the Yakṣa becomes mad in love and loses his sense to distinguish the sentient from the non-sentient :

कामार्ता हि प्रकृतिकृपणाश्चेतनाचेतनेषु¹³

and at the sight of the clouds has tears welling up :

अन्तर्बाष्पश्चिरमनुचरो राजराजस्य दध्यौ¹⁴

Another example of Karuṇa we find in the story of Puṇḍarika and Mahāśvetā :

हा हा किमिदमुपनलमिति मुक्तातर्जनादा हा अम्ब, हा तात, हा सख्य इति
व्याहरन्ती हा नाथ जीवितिनिबन्धन आचक्ष्व क्व मामेकाकिनी-
मशरणात्मकरुणं विमुच्य यासि, पृच्छ तरलिकां त्वत्कृते मया
याऽनुभूताऽवस्था युगसहस्रायमाणः कृच्छेण नीतो दिवसः¹⁵

Karuṇa is variously employed to rouse either sympathy in the heart of the *sahṛdayas* or to give them a feel of it as can be seen in the cries of the Gopīs at the time of Kṛṣṇa's departure from Vṛndāvana to Mathurā as depicted in the *Śrīmadbhāgavata* :

अहो विधातस्तव न क्वचिद्दया संयोज्य मैत्र्य प्रणयेव देहिनः।

तांश्चाकृतार्थान् वियुनङ्क्ष्यपार्थक्यं विक्रीडितं तेऽर्भकचेष्टितं यथा॥¹⁶

Here Karuṇa can very well elevate one to the realization of devotion which is considered as Rasa in the *Ujjvalanīlamanī*.

Of other Sanskrit works which have descriptions of pathetic situations mention may be made of the *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa which describes the lamentation of Aja at the loss of Indumatī. The king is unable to understand as to how the Pārijāta garland could kill his consort. He falls unconscious. He is not able to withstand the tragedy that had struck him. In the *Kumārasambhava*, the lamentation of Rati at the burning of Kāma (by Lord Śiva with fire from the third eye at the former's indiscretion) is very touching and brings before the readers the image of a forlorn lady who is compared to smoking wick. In the *Naiṣadhīyacarita* of Śrīharṣa, there is description in the first Canto itself of a golden swan which was caught by King Nala on the bank of a lake. The swan feels sorry for its mother and its consort who had just had delivery. The words of the swan betray the great upsurge of emotion in its heart, the emotion which could even move the king to shed tears and to release it.

The entire Dūtakāvya literature of Sanskrit running well over to a hundred texts is a fine specimen of Karuṇa depicting

as it does the separation of a lover from his beloved or vice versa, with all the memories of the past union crowding in and heightening the impact of loneliness.

The story of Karuṇa will never come to an end without noticing the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* of Kālidāsa where in the Fourth Act at the time of departure of Śakuntalā for her husband's home, Kaṇva feels his mind stilled and voice choked. The foster father and the foster daughter are hardly able to control their emotions. The entire scene of the departure of Śakuntalā breathes sadness. The whole of the penance grove reflects the sorrow of coming separation :

प्रियंवदा – न केवलं तपोवनविरहकातरा सख्येव। त्वयोपस्थितं वियोगस्य तपोवनस्यापि
तावत् समवस्थां प्रेक्षस्व।¹⁷

Śakuntalā breaks down while she takes leave of her childhood girl friends, the creeper Vanajyotsnā which she had tended all along and the young fawn which she had brought up with fostering care. Not in her own self her gait becomes uneven :

मार्गे पदानि खलु ते विषमीभवन्ति।¹⁸

Karuṇa again erupts in the work (the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*) in the Fifth Act when Śakuntalā is repudiated by Duṣyanta and is forsaken by her escorts, Śārṅgarava, Śāradvata and Gautamī. A helpless lady with none to look for succour she throws up her arms and begins to cry :

बाहूत्क्षेपं क्रन्दितुं च प्रवृत्ता।¹⁹

By far the most touching description of Karuṇa found in the works of Kālidāsa is met with in the *Raghuvamśa* at the time of the exile of Sītā. As Lakṣmaṇa leaves her in the jungle, she cries out like a Kurarī :

सा मुत्तकण्ठं व्यसनातिभाराच्चक्रन्द विग्ना कुररीव भूयः।²⁰

It were her cries that had brought Vālmikī to her :

तामभ्यगच्छद्दुदितानुसारी कविः कुशोष्माहरणाय यातः।²¹

As can be seen from the above some of the finest poetry in Sanskrit is that which has an element of Karuṇa in it. If its appeal to human heart, its melting, were to be the touch-stone

for the effectiveness of any Rasa, one may have to agree with Bhavabhūti in accepting Karuṇa to be the only Rasa : एको रसः करुण एव।⁴²

References

1. *Meghadūta*, Uttaramegha, verse 32, ed. Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay, 1894.
2. *Nāṭyaśāstra*, VI. 15; *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 182.
3. *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Banaras, 1985, p. 71.
4. *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 175; *Nāṭyaśāstra*, VI, 17.
5. *ibid.*, III. 177.
6. *ibid.*, III. 222.
7. *ibid.*
8. *ibid.*, III. 2.
9. *ibid.*, III.3.
10. *ibid.*, III, 4-5.
11. *ibid.*, 111.6
12. *ibid.*, III. 5.
13. *ibid.*, VI. 250-1.
14. *ibid.*, VI. 282-3.
15. *ibid.*, VI. 10.
16. *R̥gveda*, VII. 86.4
17. *Dhvanyāloka*, Karnataka University, Dharwar, 1974, p. 274.
18. *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 2.18.
19. *Raghuvamśa*, XIV.70.
20. *Dhvanyāloka*, I. 5.
21. *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 2.15.
22. *ibid.*, II. 64. 75-6.
24. *ibid.*, III. 63.6.
25. *ibid.*, III. 63.3.
26. *ibid.*, III. 63.17.
27. *Uttararāmacarita*, III. 1.
28. *ibid.*, III. 30.
29. *ibid.*, III. 47.
30. *ibid.*, I. 28.
31. *ibid.*, III. 33.
32. verse 38.
33. *Meghadūta*, Purvamegha, verse 5.
34. *Ibid.*, verse 3.
35. *Kādambarī*, Nirṇaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1916, p. 308.

36. X.39.19.
37. *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1965, p. 67.
38. *ibid.*, IV. 15.
39. *ibid.*, V. 32.
40. *Raghuvamśa*, XIV. 68.
41. *ibid.*, XIV. 68.
42. *Uttaraāmacarita*, III. 47.

Jaina Meghadūata of Merutuṅga

The *Jaina Meghadūta of Merutuṅga* of Añcalagaccha was published by the Jain Atmanand Sabha of Bhavanagar. It appears as Vol. 76 of the said Sabha's publications. It carries a Sanskrit commentary on it by one Śīlaratna which has been edited by Muni Chaturavijaya. It was printed at Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, in 1924 .

It is apiece with the Dūtakāvyas written on the model of Kālidāsa's lyric, the *Meghadūta*. Merutuṅga is not the only Jain writer to make an attempt like this. There are many others like him. The Dūtakāvyas written by other Jain writers are: *Śīladūta*, by *Caritrasundaragaṇi Pārśvābhhyudaya* by Jinasena, *Candradūta* by *Meghavijaya*, *Indudūta* by *Vinayavijaygaṇi*, besides *Manodūta* and *Cetodūta* by anonymous writers. While most of the other Dūtakāvyas by Jain writers are written on the Samasyāpūrṭi style, three lines of the respective author's composition joined on to the fourth line from the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa, the *Jaina Meghadūta* is an independent composition. Divided into four cantos it deals with the life of Neminātha when he was a child as also his acts of valour (Canto I), then the season of spring and Neminātha's sports in it (Canto II), next is described Neminātha's marriage and his renunciation of the householder life (Canto III). After this is taken up for description the lovelorn condition of Rājimatī, Neminātha's wife (Canto IV), who having spotted a cloud in the sky wants to send her message to her beloved husband to woo him back to her (Canto IV, verses 14-37). The friends of Rājimatī coming to know of this console her and tell her that however she may try her husband who has renounced the world would develop no longing for her. The words also have their effect on her. She no longer feels sad and forsaken. She goes to her husband and gets initiation from him. Like her husband she too secures

freedom from worldly attachments and attains self-realization.

Now a word about the author of the poem : Merutuṅga. Jain history knows three Ācāryas of this name of whom two are known to have some writing work to their credit. One, Merutuṅga, the pupil of Candraprabhā, the second Merutuṅga of Añcalagaccha, the pupil of Mahendraprabhasūri. It is the latter who is the author of the present poem. He was born of Naladevi wife of Vairasiṃha Porwal of the village Nani in the District of Marwar in Rajasthan in Saṃvat 1403. His original name was Vastika. Once Mahendraprabhasūri of Añcalagaccha happened to visit Nani in the course of his wanderings. Vastika got the *Dīkṣā* from him. After *Dīkṣā* he came to be known as Merutuṅga. In Saṃvat 1426 he got the title of Sūri at Patan and in Saṃvat 1445 the title of Gacchanāyaka. He died in Saṃvat 1471 at the ripe old age of 68. He spent his long life in social service. In between he also managed to devote himself to literary activity. Including the *Jaina Meghadūta* he is known to have written eight works :

- i. *Saptaikabhāṣyaṭīkā*
- ii. *Laghuśatapadī*
- iii. *Dhātupārāyaṇa*
- iv. *Śaddarśanasamuccaya*
- v. *Bālābodhavyakaraṇa*
- vi. a commentary on *Bālābodhavyakaraṇa*
- viii. *Sūrimantrakalpasāroddhāra*

Besides these *Jitakalpasāra* and *Rṣimaṇḍala* etc. are certain other works which too are ascribed to Merutuṅga but that Merutuṅga is identical with our author cannot be proved with any account of certainty.

The *Jaina Meghadūta* with its 196 verses lacks the spontaneous flow and charm of the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa after which it is modelled. The work has a large number of little known words or wellknown words used in uncommon meanings. These words have been culled from it and listed below. A collection of these words is obviously very useful for the study of Sanskrit vocabulary. Not only peculiar words, the author not uncommonly goes in the course of his poem for recondite

formations or laboured constructions. Perhaps this was due to the effect of the age in which he was living when poets and writers delighted in the use of obscure forms which would exhibit their knowledge of lexicography and grammar.

An enumeration of the recondite forms would no doubt be interesting but certainly outside the purview of the present study. Hence we restrict ourselves to the enumeration of the little known words or well-known words in little known senses only.

Adharā	- A lady with a low voice (Hīnavādīnī), II, 27.
Anantā	- The earth, I, 42.
Anabhyāśamityā	- (fem.) Not fit to be approached.
Anāśrava	- faultless. (Monier Williams notes its use in A.V.II.3.2. in the sense of not causing pain) II, 38.
Āṅkūra	- Hair, II, 10.
Āṅkepālī	- Embrace, I, 49.
Aparā	- The hind quarter of an elephant, III, 32.
Apāchī	- The Southern quarter, II, 15.
Āsyā	- State of rest, I, 16.
Uccaṇḍa	- Hanging down, II, 7.
Udvaha	- Son, III, 24.
Upayati	- Marriage, I, 31.
Urasa (N)	- Chief, main, III, 20.
Ullalana	- (from <i>ud-lal</i>) Sports, II, 44.
Ulūla (dhvani)	- The white (laughter), III, 28.
Ulloca	- An awning, a canopy, III, 26.
Kaṭīra	- Waist, II, 21.
Kamana	- Brahmā, I, 26.
Karṣū	- (i) A ditch of live charoal. (ii) A river, IV, 29.
Kāṣṭha	- A deed or action (<i>kriyā</i>), II, 30.
Kīla	- Flame, lambent flame, III, 18.
Kūkada	- (Wrongly written for kukuda) one who gives a girl in marriage with due ceremony and suitable decoration: father-in-law IV, 18.

Kṣattā	- A gate-keeper, a guard, I. 33.
Kṣīrankaṇṭha	- A youngling, an infant, I. 31.
Kṣaireyī	- A dish prepared with milk, IV. 15.
Khaṭī-(patra)	- Chalk, I. 26.
Kharu	- One who is in love with improper or prohibited things only, II. 25.
Garja	- An elephant, II. 38.
Garbhaka	- Two nights (<i>rajanīyuga</i>), II. 41.
Gatra	- The hind quarter of an elephant, II. 40.
Guccha	- A tree, I. 37.
Gūḍhamārga	- Mind, II. 18.
Gundala	- The sound of a small oblong drum (viz., Mardala), II. 44.
Gopati (lit.)	- Earth-lord, a king, II. 33.
Gohira	- Heel, I. 47.
Cari	- An animal. III, 47-48.
Cāra	- A secret place (<i>Gupti-grha</i>), III. 44.
Jarṇa	- A tree. II. 10.
Talinatā	- Meagreness, slenderness, contraction, II. 31.
Tāra	- Charming, II. 20.
Tārksyalakṣmā	- Kṛṣṇa, II. 12.
Tūru	- A musical instrument, II. 36.
Tryūṣaṇa	- (Trikaṭu) Ginger, long pepper, small pepper, IV. 29.
Diṣṭa	- Time, II. 1.
Dharma	- A bow, II. 10.
Nagna	- A bard (accompanying an army), II. 6.
Nandimukhī	- Sleep, II. 25.
Nandyāvarta	- A tree, III. 5.
Nāḍī	- A measure of time, half Muhūrta, II. 41.
Nandi	- (<i>Dvādaśavidhatūryanirghoṣa</i>), A sound of twelve kinds of wind pipes, III. 36.
Niṣka	- Gold, II. 3.
Nodya	- Wonder, II. 31.
Pakṣin	- A day with two nights enclosing it, II. 41.
Patrapāla	- A long knife, a dagger, II. 8.

Pākima	- Matured, ripened, II. 38.
Pītala	- Yellow, II. 38.
Pīlu	- An elephant, IV. 18.
Puṇḍarika	- An umbrella, III. 33.
Puruha	- Much, ample, profuse, I. 22.
Peñjūṣa	- Ear, III. 37.
Pauraka	- A garden in the neighbourhood of a city or round a house, II. 9.
Praṇāyya	- Desireless, disapproved or rejected, III. 11.
Pratigha	- Anger, wrath, III. 14.
Babhru	- Kṛṣṇa, II. 38.
Barkara	- Sport, II. 12.
Mattālamba	- A window, III. 37.
Mudira	- Cloud, II. 26.
Meghapuṣpa	- Water(of the cloud), III. 2.
Moca	- The plantain tree, II. 3.
Yāpyayāna	- Palanquin, litter, IV. 3.
Vana	- Dry, II. 38.
Varṇa	- The variegated cloth serving as elephants quarters, II. 3.
Valaja (neuter)	- Gate, city-gate, III. 40.
Vaṣā	- A woman, a elephant, II. 40.
Vasati	- Night, IV. 9.
Vindu	- Acquainted, knowing, II. 20.
Viśvā	- The earth, III. 7.
Vyuṣṭa (Neuter)	- Day-break, II. 26.
Śampā	- Lightning, III. 26.61.
Śampā (kṛtya.)	- Levelling, IV. 10.
Sattra	- A wood, forest, IV. 17.
Samjñu	- Knock-kneed, I. 32.
Sic (fem.)	- A garment, III. 4.
Sītya	- Corn or grain, III. 29.
Sumaśara	- Cupid, III. 36.
Sūrata	- Compassionate, kind, IV. 27.

Snātra	- Bath, I, 18.
Stricēlī	- A vicious or infamous lady or an unfortunate woman, II. 24.
Sthāman	- Strength, I. 22.
Hari	- Wind, I. 20.

Indudūta of Vinaya Vijayagaṇi : A Textual Study

Indudūta of Vinaya Vijayagaṇi as published in the 14th volume in the Kāvyaṃālā series is a highly corrupt work. From an editorial note on page 45, Footnote I, we come to know the reason of it. The editor says that only one manuscript of it could be found and that too was corrupt and broken at many places. It is unfortunate that the editor has done nothing to improve upon the text or to fill in the lacunae, with the result that the verses at many places have lost in clarity of meaning and have become quite unintelligible. Centuries of careless handling of the work has so thoroughly corrupted its text that it becomes impossible many times to arrive at the hypothetical original, however, ingeniously one may try to do it.

The colophon of *Indudūta* says that it is an imitation of *Meghadūta*—*Meghadūta-chāyā-kāvya*. From this it is clear that the author composed it in imitation of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. But even a cursory perusal of it shows that it is an unsuccessful attempt altogether. Excepting of course the Mandākrāntā metre and a few expressions here and there the work has very little similarity with the original whose imitation it claims to be. The text of the book, as available in the Kāvyaṃālā series, is broken at many places, and even where it is not, it is highly corrupt. But apart from it, the value of the work as a literary piece is not very high. The poet in keeping with the later poets many times overreaches himself. His language at places suffers from unnecessary paddings, as for example, in verses 27 and 50.

The poem does not have uniformity in style. It suffers from jerks. Generally verses are without a charm but occasionally after a few verses there occurs a flash when the poet gives us an original Utprekṣā or Upamā, as for example, in verse 24 where he imagines that the moon is pale like a withered leaf

because it is separated from its beloved, the night. In the day time the moon is seen to be grey in colour and this greyness the poet imagines to be due to the sorrow that the moon may be feeling on account of being separated from its beloved, the night. Now this is a very happy idea. The mushroom growth of reeds on its banks are her hair standing on end, surging waves are her hands raised to clasp her son. Now this is another nice Utprekṣā. At another place the author gives us a nice instance of Hetūtprekṣā (verse 9). Maidens generally are jealous by nature but they feel ashamed when they see other maidens' superior talents. This was precisely the reason why Lankā drowned herself in the vast ocean when she saw the glittering beauty of Vātāpādri. The Vasvaukasārā went out of sight and the Bhagavatī concealed herself in Pātāla. The poet is fond of alliteration also as for example—*pañca pañcān* (verse 22), *māravīṇām navīnām* (V. 64), *vīcihastair udastaiḥ* (V.65), *keli-līlāvilolān* (V.67), *nāvyanīrā gabhīrā* (V. 83) and *kāntāḥ vanāntāḥ* (V.90). He used Yamakā also as e.g., *narmadā narmadormi* in V.83, but in his effort for it he does not pay proper attention to meaning. In the above quotation, for example, the meaning of the word *narma* is taken to be happiness. Narmadā should, therefore, be that (river) whose waves give happiness. but the original meaning of the word Narmadā is *priyālāpā*. That his Yamaka suffers from such a looseness of meaning is illustrated by another example in V.92. It is *sumanaḥ samvitānām latānām*. Here the poet takes the meaning of the word *samvitāna* as 'full of' but actually it should mean 'spread out'. Similarly in verse 112 the author uses the expression *brahmasabrahma* etc. Here the additional *sa* is useless. It should be *brahmābrāhmarūpam*. Occasionally the poet writes verses where he uses expressions such as *kāntamekānta-kāntam*, which are of course sweet and suit the occasion. Generally the work suffers from scribal errors besides other discrepancies which have been discussed as under :

In verse 2, line 3, the author says *vinaya-vinataḥ*, i.e. *vinayena vinataḥ*. Both of these have the same sense and either of the two could suffice. It is an example of *Adhikapadatv-adoṣa*. In verse 3. line 1, the word *śīkara* should be read as

śīkhara. The word *śīkara* gives no sense, nor can the word *śīkara* be supposed here for that would infringe the metre. In the last line the author has mentioned *pañcakūṭa* mountain afterwards but the pronoun *yatra* preceding it in the second line creates a doubt and is an example of *Vidheyāvimarśadoṣa*, i.e. non-discrimination of the predicate.

Again in verse 5, line 1, *krīḍopavanapadavī* should be separate from *krīḍatām*. In the text it is jumbled up and obscures the sense. In separating the two the prose order becomes clear. *Krīḍopavanapadavī* is the agent (*Karīṭā*) and is connected with the verb *āviṣkaroti*. The *vātoddhūta*etc. are the winds compared with the symphony of the citizens which cause the peacocks to dance. This has been mentioned together with the humming of the black bees. The correct formation would have been *dhvanadvāditrahrdyān nṛtyatkeki prakarasubhagān*.

In verse 9, line 1, in *purama*, the syllable *pu* should be read as *pa*. This should be *parama* as that alone makes sense. The reading in the text *puramagurudhyāna sandhāna līnasvāntaḥ* is also otherwise faulty, *sandhāna* being redundant. Again in the second line in *kāntam tamiti rajaneḥ* the author has used *iti* between *kāntam* and *rajaneḥ* which splits both the words and is, therefore, misplaced. Viśvanātha, the author of *Sāhityadarpaṇa* has given a list of such usages and syntactical irregularities in his work.

In the first line in *dr̥ṣtvā cainam* in V. 9 the author uses the pronoun *enam* (accusative from *etad*) which is followed by *tam* in the second line. Here the pronoun *adas* (*amum*) should have been used; otherwise it is also a case of *Bhagnapra-kramatā*.

The word *sadyaḥ* and *drāk* in the second hemistich of the same verse are synonyms; any one of the two would have been sufficient.

In verse 16, line 4, the first syllable is missing, it is... *totpatu*. It may be *cintotpattau* meaning 'on the rise of anxiety'. In line 3 of the same verse *cittavṛttīm* should be read as *cittavṛttim*, it being the subject. It should be in the nominative and not in the accusative case.

In verse 18, line 4, the word *prāṇyāḥ* should be changed

into *prāṇinaḥ*. But it would infringe the metre. If it remains *prāṇyaḥ*, it would be grammatically wrong. The better reading may be *prāyaḥ santaḥ*...etc.

In verse 20, line 3, the particle *ca* after *aśyam* is unnecessary for, *ca* is a conjunctive particle. There is nothing which it may conjoin or connect.

Similarly in verse 21, line 1, the *ca* after *kautukī* is useless as it connects *yautake* with *kautukī* which makes no sense. If we replace it by the word *san* the sense will be clearer.

In verse 24, line 1, the word *varghavati* should be *vardhayati*. This is evidently a scribal error or a printing mistake.

In verse 28, line 3, *jagadvyāpi* should be combined with *sauryapratāpaḥ* to make the sense clear. It is this which pervades the whole universe.

In verse 33, line 2, the word *indindira* is used in the sense of a large bee, which is very rare.

In verse 34, line 2, *kṛidāvāpī* should be joined with *savanasa rasaiḥ* to make the sense clear. It would mean the winds which have become cool with a bath in the pleasure-lake. In line 4, of the same verse *stāt* should be read as *syāit*. It is evidently a mistake.

In verse 35, line 1, the reading *antimajinavarāḥ* is wrong. If we connect it with *Yama*... etc. then too it makes no sense. In case we read it as *Jinavarān* it will qualify the *prāsādān* in the second line, The sense will thus become a bit clearer.

In verse 37, line 2, *visarga* should be added to the word *vimānā*. It is the plural of the word *vimāna* that is meant here and not the feminine of the word *vimānā* meaning *vigato māno yasyāḥ*.

In verse 38, line 3, the word *kṛti* in *abhisṛtikṛtikṛtām* is superfluous. The editor has put an asterisk mark here. The expression appear to him to be quite puzzling. We can suggest here a conjectural emendation. According to us the whole line may be recast as *vighno yat syād abhisṛtikṛtām yositām ca tvadīyaḥ*. There does not remain any superfluous word then.

In the final line of the same verse *dūranirvāsitaḥ* should be *dāranirvāsitaḥ* and *syāt* should be *syāḥ*. This emendation would

eminently suit the context.

In verse 40, line 3, the reading *kṣaṇam iyaṃ api* should be changed into *kṣaṇam ayaṃ api* for, it is connected-with *parisara*, which is in the masculine. *Prekṣaṇīya* should be read as *prekṣaṇīyaḥ*. In the extant reading the masculine *parisara* is followed by a pronoun in the feminine which is evidently wrong.

In verse 42, line 1, *vicariṣyatyavaśyam* should be read as *vicariṣyasyavaśyam* as it is connected with *tvam*.

In verse 43, line 2, *kāryasiddhe nidānam* should be *kārya-siddher nidānam* as it is in construction with the word *vacanam*. If it has to be justified—*sthitasya gatiś cintanīyā*, it may be taken as a vocative and may be dissolved as *svīkṛtanijasuhṛdah kāryasya siddhir yena sa svīkṛtanijakāryasiddhiḥ*, i.e. who has taken the responsibility for the success of his dear friend.

In verse 45, line 4, *udghāṭanaiḥ* should be read as *udghāṭanaiḥ*. Or it may be author's own reading in the sense of *utkṣepaṇa*.

In verse 49, line 3, the word *vaya* seems to have confounded the editor; for, he has put a question mark after that. *Vaya* is *varya*. The top mark for 'r' might have been omitted in the original manuscript. This conjecture also gets support from the close proximity of *varya* with *vaidūrya*. Here the author seems to be aiming at a nice alliterative effect.

In verse 51, line 4, *svam* should be *sva*. Again, the word *bahalavidapi* should be replaced by the word *bahalaviṭapi*. Here *da* for *ṭa* may be a scribal error or a printing mistake.

In verse 52, line 3, the text is broken. If we supply the word *khara*, the lacuna can be filled up. This is supported by the context also. After the dots indicating the break in the text we have the word *karaḥ*. Before the dots we have *uṣṇāmsor api*. If *khara* is supplied we would have the complete expression *uṣṇāmsor api kharatarakarāḥ* meaning 'scorching rays of the sun.' This will also be in keeping with the author's love for alliteration which is so evident in the work.

In verse 55, line 2, the author has used the word *ripusura - jītā*. Due to scribal error or some other reason the order of the words has been inverted. The reading should have been *suraripujiṭā*.

In verse 57, line 1, *eṣām* should be *asya* for, according to context it refers to the moon. *Eṣām* cannot refer to *prāsādānām* in the previous verse for, pronouns refer to words which are used in close proximity to them ; *sarvanāmnām sannihita-parāmarśitvam*. Now even if this *nyāya* is not taken into consideration or its application in all cases is not conceded, the word *eṣām* cannot be connected with *prāsādānām* in the previous verse for, there the complete expression is *prāsādānām trikam* which is in the singular. *Eṣām*, therefore, is indefensible. It should be definitely replaced by *asya*. Although grammatically this emendation may be right yet it cannot be easily fitted into the metre for the final syllable then will remain short *laghu* which in the first *pāda* is generally considered to be a fault.

In verse 58, line 3, the editor has put a question mark after the word *kaṭukamatinām*. The word *kaṭuka* of course confuses one on account of its being used in a less known sense and again on account of its close resemblance with the word *kaṭu* meaning 'sour'. Here, however, the word does not mean 'sour'. It means 'pungent', 'sharp'. *Kaṭukamatinā*, therefore, means 'by the sharpwitted'.

In verse 60, line 2 breaks after the word *gantum ūrdhvam*. The lacuna may be filled by supplying the word *sudūram*, meaning thereby that the palace intends to go very high in the sky.

In verse 61, line 1 is found broken after *adri*. The lacuna may be filled by supplying the word *dr̥ḍhām* as it is connected with the word *puṣṭim*. The *anvaya* will then be *etāḥ dr̥ḍhām puṣṭim dadhatu*. The expression agrees perfectly with the sense. In line 3 of the same verse *sya* may be added to *auśadhīśa* to fill up the lacuna.

In verse 62, line 2, *mithyānubhāvām* should be *mithyānubhāvā* for, it is connected with *tīrtharājī*, which is in the nominative singular. The whole of the second line is a compound qualifying the word *tīrtharājī* of the first line.

In verse 63, line 2, the word *dr̥ṣṭā* should be changed into *draṣṭa* for, it is connected with the word *janaḥ*. There is no other word with which it can be connected. *Dr̥ṣṭā* is evidently

a scribal error for *draṭā*.

In verse 67, line 1 is broken after *akhila* and the next word after the break is *rajanān*. If we supply the syllable *pu* to fill up the lacuna, the expression will be *prīṇāty eṣākhilapurajanān* meaning that it pleases all the inhabitants of the city by giving them its pure waters. In line 4 of the same verse the reading *neyagādānagaryāḥ* is puzzling. The editor also has put a question mark there. Even in spite of our very best efforts it has not been possible to hit upon the correct reading in this case. The word *punīte* in line 3 of the same verse should be read as *punitaiḥ* as it is connected with *vīcīhastaiḥ* in the instrumental plural.

In verse 68, line 3, the word *upanayaiḥ* should be changed to *upanayeh*, otherwise, the sentence would be left without a verb and the meaning would also suffer. The author wants to say 'do not trouble the separated persons with your unbearably sharp rays' and for this purpose the construction should be *pāдай mā sma upanayeh*. In the same line the word *prasahyaiḥ*, which from the text as handed down to us appears to be connected with *upanayaiḥ*, is nothing but a scribal error. It ought to be *asahyaiḥ*.

In verse 74, line 3, the text is broken towards the beginning. If we supply *gra* to fill up the lacuna the complete word will be *grāmaikaikam* meaning 'each and every village'. This very well fits in the context and makes the sense perfectly clear.

In verse 75, line 1, again the text is broken. If we supply the syllable *gu* the complete word will be *pratipadagurūn* which will fit in well with the context.

In verse 79, line 1, *śamanakakubhiḥ* should be changed into *śamanakakubhā* for that alone makes sense. The sentence is *tasmād draṅgācchamanakakubhā prasthitasyāntarā te*, when you go to the southern direction from that city. Not only should the instrumental case be avoided with the word *kakubh* when it is connected with the word *prasthitasya*, the plural in *śamanakakubhiḥ* also is unjustified for, Śamana's or Yama's quarter is one and not many. The correct instrumental plural would, however, be *kakubbhiḥ* which militates against the metre.

In verse 82, line 1, *prauḍhadurgām* which qualifies *Bhṛgupuram* should evidently be *prauḍhadurgam*.

In verse 88, line 4, the word *nejaḍopi* should be changed into *no jaḍopi* for, that only makes sense. The whole line would then be *pitroḥ paśyan ka iha surataṁ lajjate no jaḍopī* meaning 'what fool in this world would not be ashamed when he sees his parent sexually united?'

In verse 91, line 4, the reading is altogether missing. We may conjecturally reconstruct it as; *preṅkhacchākḥām anilataralocchūnabhangībhir urvīm*’.

In verse 92, line 2, the reading is *vividhasumanah saṁvi - tānām latānām*. Here the word *saṁvitānām* is a big problem. If it is taken to be in the sense of a canopy of flowers a great difficulty would arise for, in the genitive plural the form would be *saṁvitānānām*. If the word *saṁvīta* in the sense of 'surrounded by' or 'full of' is taken then the metre would be infringed. The only alternative left to us is to suggest such a word in place of it as may not be far removed from the form of the present word and at the same time may yield an appropriate sense. *Samcitānām* is one such word. The complete reading then would be *vividhasumanahsamcitānām latānām* meaning 'creepers laden with a large variety of flowers'. This is a case of confusion of *ca* and *va*, which are so similar in form.

In verse 95, line 3, *nihitā meru* should be changed into *nihito meru*.

In verse 96 line 1, the word *nilacchāyām* should be *nīlacchāyam* for, it qualifies the word *puram*. In the second line a similar word is used *śubhracchāyam*. This is perfectly correct. In line 3 of the same verse the word *piṅge* should be changed into *piṅgaiḥ* for, it qualifies *ikṣudaṇḍaiḥ*. The reading evidently should have been *piṅgaiś caṅgaiḥ* meaning 'yellow coloured (i.e., ripened)' and of a superior quality. *Caṅga* is a Prakrit word. It may be that the poet originally read *piṅgair aṅgaiḥ*.

In the second line *vismṛtaiḥ* should be changed into *viśṛtaiḥ* as that alone makes sense.

In verse 97, line 3 is broken. The particle *su* would serve well to fill up the lacuna. The word then will be *surajāḥ*.

In verse 98, line 4, the word *kṣaudre* is confusing. The word *kṣudra* means honey. Here it has the unusual sense of *kṣudraiḥ*

kr̥taḥ, 'performed by the mean'.

In verse 103, line 1, the text breaks after *cārtha pau*. If we add *rān* to *pau* we would have the complete reading *cārthpaurān*. In *cārtha* the 'r' is superfluous. The proper word should be *cālha*. It means 'and also'. The meaning of the whole line would now be as follows: You will see the people mounted on elephants, horses, and also the other citizens. The amended text thus suits the context eminently.

In verse 105, line 2 *Sudharmyā* of Indra is mentioned. It should be changed to *Sudharmā* for, that is the word for an assembly hall of the gods. *Sudharmyā* is, therefore, incorrect.

In verse 106, line 2, the *sakhayati* is probably a mis-print for *sukhayati*.

In verse 107, line 4, the *anusvāra* should be added to the word *lakṣmī* for, it is to be connected with the word *nidadhataḥ*. In verse 110, line 1, the word *kathina* is evidently wrong. It should be *kathina*. The third line of the same verse is broken. The lacuna may be filled up by adding *śyā* to *mā* meaning 'light blue coloured'. The word *dyati* is evidently a mis-print for *dyuti*. Line 4, of the same verse is again broken in the end after *bahi*. The lacuna may be filled up by adding *śca*.

In verse 111, line 1, the word *asiti* should be read as *asita* for, there is no word *asiti* as such. It qualifies the word *śmaśru*. The meaning is 'dark moustaches'. In the same line the *kūrcāṅkurodyān* is evidently wrong. It should be *rādyān*. In the same verse lines 3 to 4, are *vaidrumīm akṣamālām rāgam prāptām iva guruguṇair ghūrṇamānām ca citre*. Here the word should be *citrām*; the garland of pearl-beads cannot evidently rotate in an image. Or *citre* may go with *anke* in the next verse.

In line 3 of verse 113, *arhan* should be *arhān* for, it is connected with the world *lokān*.

In verse 115, line 1, in the word *namada sumatām* the genitive is used for the dative, which runs counter to Sanskrit usage.

In verse 117, line 1, the word *jāpa* has been used. It is a solecism. The correct form is *japa*. In verse 120, line 4, the word *sampadi* would be *samsadi*. The construction of the sentence would then be *surāṇām saṁsadi Indram* etc.

In verse 130, line 2, the word *manāstvena* should be *manastvena*. In the same verse line 3, the text is broken after *sampratyahani*. After this word there is only one letter *śi*. Possibly *ni* is missing. The original reading might have been *sampratyahani niśi vā*. It is logical that *niśi* should follow *ahani*.

Finally, it may be remarked that inspite of our very best efforts, there is still one verse where a reading is enigmatic. In verse 99, line 3, the reading is *kuṭrāpyādyādyaraka janitāḥ*. It is a puzzle. The editor has also put a question mark here.yu

A Critical Survey of Sanskrit Dūtakāvyas

The idea of conveying messages through messengers is fairly old. Even in the Vedas Agni (Fire-god) is asked to carry the prayers of the sacrificers or their offerings to other gods. He is known as the *Devadūta* or *Vahni*, the bearer. It is through him that the *yajamāna* hopes to send his oblations to the other deities. He serves as a link between the sacrificer on the earth and the gods in the heaven. There is a distance of millions of miles between the two, yet the message is conveyed and is received by the *devas* through their *dūta*, the Agni. Agni in the Veda is supposed to be a god with a human form, invested with life and soul. As a matter of fact, it is the deified earthly fire which is supposed to carry the message or the offerings of the *yajamāna*. Thus the idea of things in Nature being treated as messengers goes back to a hoary past. And there is nothing improbable in it. Human emotions remain the same in all times and climes. A man widely separated from the one he holds dear would try to catch at anything that may serve his purpose. He would try that his feelings be conveyed to the person far away, that his feelings be conveyed to the person far away, that his ideas may touch his affectionate companion though he be thousands of miles away. This very idea is at the back of the sending of the presents too. By means of presents one likes to convey to the other person a measure of his feelings and emotional attachment to him but when the person is far away how is this emotional attachment to be conveyed? Even now-a-days when science and technology have annihilated distance, it is not always easy for people living far away to come together and exchange their ideas and feelings for each other. When this is the state to-day, one has only to imagine as to what would have been the position in days of yore when means of communication were far too primitive and inadequate. Going out to a distant land would not mean a transient separation but

keeping away for a long time, may be, for all time. In that event it was natural for people in those days to see any moving thing and then under the emotional stress think that it would convey an element of their mental agony to the person far away. This is the background of Nala's sending a *hansa* to Damayantī, his sweetheart. The story as it goes in the *Mahābhārata* is that King Nala fascinated by the news of the charms and beauty of Damayantī deputed a *hansa* to convey to her that he (Nala) is in love with Damayantī. Now Nala's employment of *hansa* as his *dūta* is very ingenious. The *hansa* goes to Damayantī's palace and delivers Nala's message. Damayantī is then smitten with love and thus both the lovers are equally attracted towards each other. It is this love which ultimately culminates into Nala's marriage with Damayantī. This was the traditional inspiration for Kālidāsa to pick up a cloud as messenger. The idea of employing a messenger for conveying messages was fairly old but Kālidāsa made a bold departure in that he employed an inanimate cloud as messenger. Hithertofore from the scanty material available with us we can say that only animate beings had been employed as messengers. But the poet Kālidāsa's Muse could not be fettered by tradition. Its flight brought it to the regions where the difference of animate and inanimate ceases due to emotional stress and strain : *prakṛitīkṛpaṇāś cetanācetanēṣu*. It becomes a living organism full of sentiments, emotions and feelings. It is addressed as 'brother'. The cloud is no doubt presented as a man. Kālidāsa attributes to it all the feelings of a man, and the tender emotions that the Yakṣa experiences. In spite of all the superstructure that has been raised to make the cloud appear a living being the inanimateness of the cloud, however, peeps out. It is a human being in Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* who thinks and speaks through the cloud. The cloud always remains in the background. The Yakṣa is always in the foreground. In his moments of extreme anguish and agony Yakṣa forgets that it is not an inanimate cloud that he is addressing. He thinks that the cloud also thinks like him and will act as he would like him to. Kālidāsa succeeds eminently in depicting the state of the human mind when a man is so absorbed in himself that the world outside him perhaps does

not exist for him. And if at all it exists; it exists for him only. This is why the Yakṣa becoming oblivious of the fact that a cloud is a *jaḍapadārtha*, (an inanimate object) picks it up as his messenger. That is the highest peak of his self-centredness. It was perhaps given to Kālidāśa only, to depict this extreme self-centredness which he depicts in three places in his works. In the *Sākuntala* the innocent Sakuntalā incurs the displeasure of the fierce sage Durvāśas on account of this very extreme self-centredness. Although the sage announces his advent she pays no attention to him. For her the entire world has become Duṣyanta. Similar extreme self-centredness has been depicted by Kālidāśa in his *Kumārasambhava* too. Pārvatī is so devoted to Lord Śiva that for her everything in the forest appears to be Śiva. It was this faculty of describing the extreme self-centredness that won Kālidāśa a name which will ever remain enshrined in the pages of Indian literary history. It is extreme self-centredness of Yakṣa that makes him impart to the cloud all his feelings and emotions. To whatever direction the cloud may move he thinks it is going towards his beloved's place. He gives it a message which it has to convey to the beloved.

The later dūtakāvyaś are modelled on the *Meghadūta*. Barring a few, all of them employ birds as messengers. This is perhaps more in line with the earlier Indian tradition. The employment of a *haṁsa* as a *dūta*, in the story of Nala and Damayantī in the *Mahābhārata* perhaps suggested the use of birds as messengers to the poets. Their style, diction or delineation of sentiment owes much to that of the *Meghadūta* but the use of birds as messengers, they owe probably to a much older source. As it happened each poet tried to employ a different bird to serve as a messenger. If one poet employed a *haṁsa* the second one thought it wise to use a cuckoo or a peacock while the third one employed a bee. Thus it happened that poets went in search of newer and newer birds to serve as messengers. Each one vied with another to convey his message through a different bird. In a way it has been good too. For it has led to a greater variety and more charm. If the same birds had been used by the poets to serve as messengers the dūtakāvyaś would have been a mass of dull and insipid poetry.

As they are, they are quite pleasant and charming. This phenomenon has been rather helpful in providing an occasion to poets to exercise their ingenuity too.

Now a word about those *dūtakāvya*s in which abstract conceptions like morality or *sila* are treated as messengers. This represents a later phenomenon. In Sanskrit dramas *Prabodhacandrodaya* is the only work where abstract conceptions like Prabodha, Buddhi, Krodha, Moha etc. are found as characters. No other similar work in Sanskrit has been discovered so far. We can place these *dūtakāvya*s in a category where the mind of certain people is highly obsessed with philosophical conceptions. A poet or a dramatist uses abstract conceptions as messengers only to give an expression to his innate love for them. He thinks that by personification they will become more easy and understandable to a common man. That is the approach of any practical philosopher, poet or philosopher-playwright. Generally the philosophical conceptions are too abstruse and abstract for a common man. They are very often beyond his reach. He, therefore, wants to avoid them as far as possible. But for the thinkers and preachers who are out to preach their religion to a common man it becomes imperative to put them in a form that may be acceptable to the common man. In this way they hope to inculcate the highest truths of their religion through the medium of light literature. Most of these *dūtakāvya*s where abstract conceptions are treated as messengers are composed by the Jainas. Their aim in choosing the abstract conceptions as messengers appears to be to propagate them and to make the readers acquainted with the broad principles of Jainism. It is a tribute to the ingenuity of the authors that they chose the medium of the *dūtakāvya* which since ages has caught the fancy of the people of the country. They realised that people would be only too prepared to listen to them and if properly approached, would be converted to their viewpoint, provided an attempt were made through the medium of lyric poetry which so much appealed to them. People in days gone by wanted to sing the *Mandākrāntā* verses of Kālidāsa and enjoy their lilting melody. Just as they could sing the verses of the *Meghadūta* they could very well sing the verses of the *Cetodūta*

or the *Śīlādūta* too and consciously or unconsciously imbibe the principles and doctrines enunciated therein. That must have been the idea of the authors of such dūtakāvyas. It may also be that these works were composed for the adherents of Jainism to acquaint them more fully with its principles and the doctrines in a language they could understand very well. It is human weakness that people like to read the light literature generally. Dramas, poems, stories and novels appeal to them and if they are used for a particular aim or purpose, that goes right deep into their mind. Bernard Shaw, the playwright and Somerset Maugham, the story-writer through their plays and stories, laid their fingers right at the weak spots of society. Their works, therefore, served their end much more forcefully than any amount of preaching could have done. People generally do not take kindly to preaching. That is why we find stories in the Upaniṣads and Brāhmaṇas called the *arthavādas*. These *arthavādas* serve to highlight a philosophical speculation and make it acceptable to the people much more forcefully than anything else. This is also the basis of stories in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Pañcatantra*. The reason given is *bālā - nām sukhaldhāya*. The *bālas*, or the ignorant ones, are generally not able to climb up to the philosophical heights. They are the men of the soil. They can understand only the language of the soil. In the *Meghadūta* Kālidāsa blazed the trail that kept on burning even after many centuries. After the *Meghadūta* there was an outburst of unusual literary activity resulting in the growth of the dūtakāvyā literature of considerable magnitude. The sweet music of the *Meghadūta* so inspired the later writers that they tried to sing in the way the great master had done but it is an admitted fact that they could not measure up to the standards of *Kavikulaguru*. Most of these dūtakāvyas were only cheap imitations of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. Some of them were written for an avowed purpose of recapturing the spirit of the *Meghadūta* which unfortunately proved far too elusive. One thing that stands out by the study of the later dūtakāvyas literature is that it has pretty little original to offer to the reader. The form and content in later dūtakāvyas in more cases than one is borrowed from the *Meghadūta* of

Kālidāsa. Six or seven of them are written on the popular style of *samasyāpūrti* where one line from the *Meghadūta* is conjoined with three lines of the poet's own creation. Some of the *dūtakāvyas* are worth-while while others are poor. The question is why was it that an element of gradual decay was visible in the *dūtakāvya* literature? An analysis of the causes that may be responsible for this is interesting as well as illuminating.

One of the reasons for this seems to be Kālidāsa's superiority over other poets. All along the Indian tradition Kālidāsa has been called *Kavikulaguru* or *Kavikulacūḍāmaṇi*. He is ranked superior to all other poets of ancient India. The other *dūtakāvyas* that were modelled on his work naturally, therefore, suffered by way of comparison. Some of the *dūtakāvyas* in themselves are not so bad as to be rejected outright by a literary critic, but when compared with Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* they do not have much appeal.

Had it not been for Kālidāsa, these works would have been ranked as specimens of good poetry worthy of recognition at the hands of scholars and critics. Such, for example are the *Pavanadūta* and the *Nemidūta*.

The second reason appears to be the decline in the general standards of literary activity in particular periods. On account of a number of reasons in particular periods there appears an outburst of unusual activity in all branches of learning, culture and civilization. In England in Shakespeare's time such an activity appeared. That was called the Renaissance period. On account of progress in all directions that period is known as the golden period of British History. But after Shakespeare for sometime we do not hear of an outstanding man of letters. Poetasters replaced the poets and imitators followed the original writers. The same thing happened in India too. Kālidāsa's period is known to Indian History as the golden period, for in that the Indian genius threw up a number of gems, the *Navaratnas*. Kālidāsa was one of them. There was an unusual activity in literature, arts, sciences and medicine. It is no use repeating what is so well known to history. After the golden period there came a time when tinsel replaced gold. Original activity came

almost to a stop and there were very few writers left whose contributions led to the enrichment of literature and philosophy. Take for example, grammar. There we find the age of commentaries appearing after the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Vākyapadīya*. In Medicine a rehash of Suśruta and Caraka comes on the scene. In Astrology India becomes a *śiṣya* of the Romans and the Greeks and in Mathematics and Sciences the days of the discovery of the zero which revolutionised mathematical studies in ancient days is gone. It is no wonder therefore that the poets coming after the first dūtakāvya do not measure up to the heights of Kālidāśa.

As time rolls on due to political factors the writers become less and less original with the result that some other dūtakāvyaś that are found today are not of much use as pieces of literature. Of course we can't dismiss them as useless as sources of the contemporary history and culture of the country but their literary value does not compel our attention.

This fact, though unfortunate in the extreme, is nevertheless true. It seems the later poetasters—it is a misnomer to call them poets—were so charmed by the *Meghadūta* that they also wanted to try their hand at writing works of the type. This might have served the purpose of satisfying the ego of these poets although some of them at least have very little value so far as poetry is concerned.

The third reason is the unusual influence exercised by the *Meghadūta* on the minds of the later poets which killed their initiative and smothered their originality. The *Meghadūta* was a model for them in style and content and they had to adhere to it. When something becomes a model, it leaves little room for originality and innovations and without originality and innovations it is very difficult to create a literature of permanent value and abiding interest.

The fourth reason may be the change in the political climate of the country. With the coming into power of the Mohammedans, Sanskrit suffered a definite setback in India. Hithertfore the patronage which the Hindu kings had been extending to the authors of Sanskrit encouraged them to continue their literary activities. Now the Mohammadans, at

least some of them were not only opposed to Sanskrit but were positively hostile to it. Imbued with their fanatical zeal to propagate Islam these barbarians from Turkey and Mangolia were out to crush and destroy everything that was Hindu. They carried fire and sword wherever they went. With a few noble exceptions they destroyed temples, harrassed people and burnt libraries. In such an atmosphere when there were frequent outbursts of killing and incendiaryism it was impossible for literature to flourish. Whatever literary activity that went on in the country inspite of the hostility of the paramount power owed its inspiration to the patronage of the Hindu aristocracy which could not be wiped out even by the frequent orgies of violence. Due to this peculiar situation in the country it was not possible for Sanskrit works of great merit to be produced and this partly accounts for the paucity of talent and lack of originality on the part of the writers and poets of Sanskrit that came on the scene. Serious literary activity can only continue when there is peaceful atmosphere all round. In an uncertain atmosphere when there is no body to recognize or patronize talent, only mediocrities hold the scene.

The fifth reason for the decay of the *dūtakāvya* literature in Sanskrit is the rise of the *Prākritis*, the *Apabhraṃśas* and the modern dialects. This is not to say that no *dūtakāvya* was composed after a particular time, it only means that as the regional languages progressively supplanted Sanskrit, works began to be composed in those languages. Writers began to exercise their poetical ability and express themselves through the medium of these languages. So those writers also who had the fascination for composing *dūtakāvyas* composed them in their respective regional languages and dialects spoken and understood by the people.

So we can say that there was no change in the desire and inclination of the poets to write *dūtakāvyas* or poems in which somebody or something had to act as a messenger to convey a message. This had so captivated in the minds of the people that there could be no question of the cessation of the *dūtakāvya* activity. Their popular appeal persisted. The poets had to cater to the demand of the populace and they did it in their own

language. So the dūtakāvyā activity cannot be said to have suffered a setback in the country. What happened was the change in the vehicle of expression. What formally used to be written in Sanskrit came to be written in the different regional languages. Thus viewed, there was no decay of the dūtakāvyā literature. But so far as dūtakāvyā literature in Sanskrit was concerned, stagnation was slowly visible; gradually the number of dūtakāvyas written in Sanskrit began to fall till we arrive at a time when there remained only a trickle. Dūtakāvyas in Sanskrit are composed even now in India but they are few and far between. Occasionally a Pandit here or there brings out a small poem containing a few scores of ślokas to give expression to his poetical ability or to show off his competence in composing verses in Sanskrit. There is practically little originality in the attempt though the charm may be still there. The tradition so far as dūtakāvyas composed in Sanskrit is concerned, stands broken and no amount of occasional or casual efforts of a coterie of scholars of Sanskrit can hope to revive it.

Description of Individual Dūtakāvyas

Meghadūta of Kālidāsa

Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* is widely known love-lyric having one hundred and ten¹ verses in the Mandākrāntā metre. It has caught popular imagination in Sanskrit. The story goes that Kubera once turned out a certain Yakṣa for one year for neglect of duty. The Yakṣa took up his abode at Rāmagiri mountain. On the first day of the month of Āṣāḍha, he saw a cloud on the sky and requested him to convey his message to his beloved consort residing at Alakā.

The poem is divided into two parts, the Pūrva Megha and the Uttara Megha. The former contains the description of the route which the cloud is expected to traverse and the latter contains a vivid description of Alakā, the, dreamland of pleasure and the message which the cloud is asked to convey to the Yakṣa's consort.

The richness of Kālidāsa's imagination is revealed in the colourful descriptions of Ujjayinī, the Himālayas and the Kailāśa mountain. His art seems to be natural. The poem contains a graphic description of India's important towns, mountains, cities, rivers, pilgrim-centres etc. It abounds in figures of speech, *Utprekṣā*, *Arthāntaranyāsa*, etc., and is written in a very simple and lucid style.

Jaina Meghadūta of Merutuṅga

Most of the dūtakāvya's are unfortunately not dated. This Jaina work, however, is different. It gives welcome information about its date. The author of this poem, Merutuṅga, was born in a village known as Nani in the year 1403 Vikrama era, i.e. 1346 A.D. His original name was Vāstika. He was great scholar of Sanskrit and Prakrit. He died at the age of 68.

This poem contains 196 verses in all the four cantos. In it the poet has given a description of Neminātha who becomes a recluse. His beloved wife sends him a message inquiring after the condition of the bereaved family.

Meghābhyudaya (Anonymous)

A fragmentary manuscript of it having 26 verses in different metres has been found recently.² The author and the commentary on it are both anonymous.

Though the colophon of this work is not known and the verses after the 26th are missing the work may belong to the 18th century.

The poet has composed this work on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. The opening verses are in the Mandākrāntā metre but after the tenth verse we find Sragdharā, Āryā, Upajāti and such like metres. The poet has an intense fondness for alliteration, as for example:

*navāmbuvidyullatayā samantataḥ
tato vimuñcanti samam samantataḥ
vinodayann ambudharā kalāpinaḥ
dovikṣate candramasaḥ kalāpinaḥ*

The substance of the available part is as under :

The rainy season has approached and the clouds, dark all round, accompanied with lightning have covered the sky. The

peacocks and other birds including all the flora and fauna are pleasing everywhere. Everybody is rejoicing and the cool breezes are blowing. A lover is scheduled to go out and the beloved, inspite of her efforts, fails to prevail upon him to change his decision. She is much perplexed. The lover is away and the beloved beguiles her weary hours in a very sorry state till at last she loses her senses.

The messenger seems to be the cloud. The poem is a very nice piece of a love-lyric but unfortunately the complete work is not available. Some words are peculiar to us (for instance *Jalālī*). The poet seems to be a Vaiṣṇavite since he writes Rāma, Rāma, etc. at the end of every verse.

Meghadautyam of Trailokyamohana Guhaniyogī

The author of this poem is known to us as Trailokyamohana Guhaniyogī who composed it about fifty years back. It consists of two hundred stanzas in the Mandākrāntā metre.

The language of the poem is very simple. The subject matter is similar to that of the *Meghadūta*. In form too it has similarity with the *Meghadūta* with this difference that in this dūtakāvya the beloved sends the message to the lover.

The story goes like this : A Yakṣī receives the message from her lover and responds to it. She wants to convey her feelings and emotions and gives them a clear expression.

A large number of verses are close imitation of the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa. The poet seems to have good knowledge of rhetorics and prosody. This *virahakāvya* is one of the biggest works found in the dūtakāvya literature. The poet has no thorough mastery over Sanskrit grammar and has deliberately put in obscure words to display his skill in poetry.

Pārsvābhyudaya of Jinasena

It is divided into four cantos. There are three hundred and sixty four verses in all in this poem : one hundred and eighteen in the first, the same number in the second, fifty-seven in the third, and seventy-one in the fourth. Due to its having been written on the *Samasyāpūrṭi* scheme the whole poem has been composed in the Mandākrāntā metre except the last six verses of the fourth canto where five verses are in Mālinī and the

remaining one in the Vasantatilakā. The poem imitates the *Meghadūta* in every respect with this difference that at places the dull and the drab descriptions impede the flow of the work.

There need be no controversy about the date of the author of this work which was composed, as has been expressly stated by the author himself, during the reign of Amoghavarṣa I of the Rāṣtrakūṭa dynasty. The following two verses of the poem may be quoted here with advantage :

- i *iti viracitam etat kāvyam āveṣṭya megham
bahagunam apadoṣam Kālidāsasya kāvyam
malinītaparakāvyam tiṣṭhad āśaśūnikam
bhuvanam avatu devaḥ sarvadāmoghavarṣaḥ* ||
- ii. *śrīvīrasenamunipādapayojabhṛigaḥ
śrīmān abhud vinayasenamunir garīyān
taccoditena jinasenamuniśvareṇa
kāvyam vyadhāyi pariveṣṭitameghadūtam* ||

Amoghavarṣa is believed to have ascended the throne in Śaka 736 and continued to rule till Śaka 799. The theme of the work is as under :

There is one Kamaṭha who having been expelled by king Aravinda goes to the bank of the river Sindhu to practice penance. When Marubhūti (Pārśvanātha), the younger brother of Kamaṭha learns this he comes to him (Kamaṭha). When Kamaṭha, sees Marubhūti he is at once reminded of the past hostilities and thinks of killing him. On account of his Māyā he brings forth rains, roars like a lion and rails at Marubhūti. When he finds that all this has left Marubhūti cold, he invites him for a duel and advises him to go to Alakāpurī when he would meet his doom at his hands. He further advises him to assume the form of a cloud after his death, to go to Alakā passing on the way from Rāmagiri, wherefrom the journey would begin, to Amrakūṭa mountain, the Daśārṇa country with its capital at Vidiśā, the rivers Nirvindhya and Sindhu, the city of Ujjayinī where it (the cloud) is advised to see the Jaina temples, the river Gambhīrā, the mountain Devagiri, the river Carmaṇvatī, the city of Daśapura and the river Sītā, the region of Brahmāvarta, Kurukṣetra, the sacred places of Balarāma in its vicinity and the Kanakhala mountain which will usher him to

Alakā. The poet's description of Alakā is really charming. Equally charming is the description of the union of Vasundharā, the wife of Marubhūti in an earlier birth with her husband (Marubhūti). The whole scene is highly pathetic and emotional.

As Kamaṭha has been saying all this Marubhūti (Pārśvanātha) maintains his calm. At that Kamaṭha again challenges him for fight but that too leaves Marubhūti cold. Then Kamaṭha creates a bevy of young girls on account of his Māyā. They approach Marubhūti singing and dancing, but Marubhūti remains unaffected. All his efforts gone in vain, Kamaṭha feels highly insulted. He lifts up a rock and when he is about to strike Marubhūti's head with it a Nāga king Dharaṇendra accompanied by his wife comes there. On seeing him Kamaṭha takes to flight but Nāgarāja prevents him from doing so, offers him *abhaya*, reminds him of all his evil deeds in previous births and prays to God to have mercy on him (Kamaṭha). And then he spreads an umbrella of his hoods on the head of Marubhūti who is none else than Lord Pārśvanātha himself. The wife of Nāgarāja too does likewise. At this Kamaṭha feels penitent and asks forgiveness for all his earlier crimes. When he is praying there flows forth a stream of tears from his eyes. At this sight the gods shower flowers from the heaven, and the *dundubhis* are sounded. The gods come from the heaven to Pārśvanātha. The *lāpasas* too come to him. At this the story of the kāvyā comes to an end.

Pavanadūta of Dhoyi

It is the oldest available work barring the *Meghadūta*, *Ghatakarparakāvya* and *Candradūta* of Jambū- kavi. The poem contains 104 verses in Mandākrāntā metre.

The *Pavanadūta* of Dhoyi has been published in Sanskrit *Sahitya Parishad Series*, as work No. 11 and has been very ably edited by Chintaharan Chakravarti with a detailed introduction in English covering as many as 26 pages from which we learn much about the poet. According to Chakravarti Dhūyi, Dhoyi, Dhoi or Dhoyika as the poet is variously called belonged to the court of King Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal of the 12th century A.D. He was known to have been one of the five jewels of Lakṣmaṇasena's court. The verse which enumerates the names

of these five jewels does not specifically mention Dhoyi but mentions one *Kavirāja* who have been conclusively proved by Chakravarti to be no other than the poet Dhoyi who more than once in his *Pavanadūta* refers to himself as *kaviṣmābh - rīṭām cakravartī*³ and *kavina- rapatī*⁴. The colophon of the work also reads *iti śrī Dhoyikavirā- javiracitam*. As has been said above King Lakṣmaṇasena belonged to the 12th century A.D. So Dhoyi must have flourished in that century. The upper limit of the poet is furnished by the discovery of the verses attributed to him which begin to appear in works like *Saduktikarṇāmrta* (1205 A.D.); Jalhana's *Subhāṣita Muktvālī* (middle of the 13th century) and the *Śārngadha- rapaddhati* (14th century).

The poet has selected a historical character as the hero of his work. It is said that once Lakṣmaṇasena invaded and conquered Malayācaladeśa. During his campaign a Gandharva girl of Kanakapurī was fascinated by his beauty, although she could not disclose her feelings to him. After a few days' stay the king left the place and the heroine became sad. She then sent the wind as messenger to convey her feelings to the king residing at his capital Vijayapuram in Bengal.

The poet depicted a nice picture of the heroine who is in a very sad condition. The poem has won for him a name. It is a fact that very few poems can excel it or even equal it.

Pavanadūta of Vādicandra

This poem is written by Vādicandra who in the colophon gives the name of his Guru as Śāntinātha. The poem consists of one hundred and one stanzas in the Mandākrāntā metre. It does not follow the usual style of the dūtakāvya, as there is no mention of the route. Nor has it any of the attractions of a lyric-poem. The theme of the poem is:

Tārā, the wife of a king named Vijaya has been abducted by another king whom the poet calls by the name, Khecara or Khagapati. The lover while thinking of her beloved's talents bursts into tears and requests the wind to convey his message to her. Thereafter he tells it (the wind) the charms of the journey although the names of the places *en route* are not given. The wind is to pass through the woods, the mountains, the rivers, etc. The wind is requested not to put off the lamps at the moment

when Khecaras are busy in their sexual merry-making, for they would like to see the naked bodies of their consorts¹. The lover is busy in brooding over the departure till at last the wind reaches the beloved who is busy in meditation of Jineśa.

The wind reaches the abductor too. Then there are a few verses put into the mouth of the wind which are of a didactic nature. The wind informs the king that the consequences of abducting another's wife are not good. The mother of the abducting king intervenes just when he is trying to make preparations for a combat, and at her instance the abducted Tārā is handed over to the wind who brings her back to the lover.

Vātadūta of Kṛṣṇanātha

This virahakāvya of one hundred verses is written by Kṛṣṇanātha Pañcānana who is said to have flourished during the last century.

The subject-matter of this work is Sītā's abduction; the same as mentioned by Vālmīki in his *Rāmāyaṇa*. The story of the poem in brief is that Sītā who has been abducted by Rāvaṇa. feels very sad and requests the wind to convey her message to Rāma.

The style of the poem is as attractive as that of the *Padmadūta*.

In the first part the poet describes the said condition of Sītā. After this there is the description of the route to be followed by the messenger. Thereafter comes the description of Rāma's Āśrama. Then are described a number of things such as Sītā's friends, Muni Āśrama, sunrise, sunset, Rāma's condition in Sītā's absence, her message to Rāma, benedictions, prayers, etc.

Aniladūta of Rāma Dayālu Tarkaratna

This poem has been composed by Rāmadayālu of Bhaṭṭapālī who was patronized by the king of Vardhamāna state. *The work has not been published so far.*

The theme of the poem is the same as that of the other dūtakāvyaś concerned with Kṛṣṇa's and Gopī's love-affairs. The messenger is wind i.e. *anila*, which is requested by the Gopīs to convey their feelings to Kṛṣṇa who is requested to come back from Madhupura to Vṛndāvana.

Maruddūta of R.C. Śānta Śālihāsa

The latest of the *dūtakāvya*s of this category is the *Maruddūta* by Rameśacandra Śānta Śālihāsa. It is published serially in the *Divya-Jyotiḥ*, a Sanskrit monthly from Simla; the last instalment having been published in its issue of November, 1961. It is a small poem of not much literary merit, and abounding in grammatical and other errors. It is a poor attempt and does little credit to the author. The theme of the work is:

A follower of Mahātmā Gandhi is put in a prison. After he has been there for sometime, he feels a longing for his wife and son, who are in Indraprastha, the old name for Delhi. The prisoner in these moments experiences the sweet touch of the Malaya breeze from a small opening in his cell and eagerly asks it to convey his message to his kith and kin who are living far away in Delhi. The breeze is to start from somewhere in Eastern India where the man is made to live in confinement during the British days and pass on its long journey through Vārāṇasī, Prayāga (Allahabad), and Kanpur from where it is to take a turn to Agrā to have a look at the famous Taj. From Agrā it is to proceed to Delhi. At this the poem comes to an end. The message is not described. May be, it is to be taken up in the coming issue or issues but there is no indication to the effect in the November issue of the Magazine which in its previous issues carried the note 'to be continued'. In the course of the description of the journey the poet describes in vivid detail the famous cities and towns that fall on the way, Vārāṇasī, Prayāga etc. with all that is worth seeing in them. Here and there, there are poetic flashes, too, but their charm is very much marred by the inadequacy of expression and faulty idioms, which are unfortunately not a few in the poem.

Indudūta of Vinayavijayagaṇi

Vinayavijayagaṇi, a Jain poet has composed this work consisting of 131 verses in the *Mandākrāntā* metre after the usual pattern of the *dūtakāvya*s. The theme of this work is :

Vinayavijayagaṇi, a native of Dvādaśāvarta, has observed celibacy and is absorbed in his meditations in the benign company of his gracious teacher residing at a pilgrimage-centre

named Yodhapura. After the usual evening prayers the poet is just out to pay his homage at the sacred feet of his Guru Tapagaṇapati but all of a sudden he goes to sleep and enters a dreamland. He looks at the rising moon and entreats him to convey his message to his revered teacher. He praises the high family of the Moon; her pedigree showing her relation with Lakṣmī and other gods. Then he relates the route from Yodhapura to Surat. It is in the last verse only that he states his message. It is a request to the effect that the venerable teacher whom he is worshipping constantly may remain kind and considerate to him so that he may continue to follow his path and gain emancipation.

It is a nice little poem and makes a delightful reading. It is rich in fine figures of speech. The flight of imagination displayed by the poet is commendable. The predominant note in it is that of tranquility and not Karuṇa (Pathos) which is a common characteristic of the dūtakāvyas.

Candradūta of Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkāṇkāra

This small dūtakāvyā is attributed to Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkāṇkāra. He was a great logician. He is said to be the son of Gopikānta Bhaṭṭācārya who commented on the *Kāvya-prakāśa*. The poet's intention is to propagate his doctrines or philosophy through the medium of the light literature.

The poem shows close similarity with the *Padāṅkadūta* where the poet is more interested in philosophical speculation through a poem.

From the Mālyavat Parvata, Rāma sends Hanumat to Lāṅkā. He comes back after seeing Sītā. Rāma is very sad because of Sītā's separation. In a state of awful bewilderment he espies the rising moon who is moving towards Lāṅkā and asks her to convey his message to Sītā.

Candradūta of Vinayaprabhu

The work contains only 12 verses. The first eleven verses are in Varṇasasthavilā metre and the last one is in Anuṣṭubh. The theme of this work is that a lady separated from her lover sends a message to him through the moon. The moon is requested to inform the hero that his beloved is dying by inches.

The moon is moved by her piteous condition and bewilderment. She relates the sad plight of the lady to her lover who being charmed by the melodious voice of the moon come back and thus the couple enjoys a happy reunion.

The poem is really a nice piece where the messenger not only relates the message but actually brings about the desired end.

Candradūta of Jambūkavi

The poet flourished in the 10th century. This small poem contains only 23 verses in the Mālinī metre. The work though small, can be placed among some of the master-pieces of the dūtakāvya literature. The work is also useful for the history of India for it gives chronology of a certain period. Most of the verses are Yamakas of a subtle nature. A large number of scholars or rhetoricians quote these verses in their works.

The theme of the poem is the conventional one peculiar to the dūtakāvyas. A lady separated from her lover requests the moon to go to her lover and inform him of her pangs of separation she is suffering from his absence. The moon is asked by the lover kindly to come back and enjoy her sweet company.

Pikadūta of Rudranyāyapañcānana

Pikadūta is attributed to Rudra Nyāyapañcānana. Only a fragmentary copy of it having about 30 verses is available. The metre used in this work is Śārdūlavikrīḍita.

As in the *Ghaṭakarpara-Yamaka-Kāvya* and in some other dūtakāvyas, so in this poem also the messenger is sent by the beloved to the lover.

The tradition of describing the route to be followed by the dūta is missing in this poem. The story in brief runs thus :

Kṛṣṇa has left for Mathurā. Vṛndāvana is no place of attraction to Rādhā. It is simply repelling and fortunately for Rādhā a cuckoo happens to pass nearby. She humbly requests it to convey her message to her lover. She does not like to send a beetle as it would surely cling to Kṛṣṇa's lotus-like feet, since it is in the nature of the beetles to run after the lotus-flowers. The beetle would surely fail to convey the message and come

back again. Earlier Rādhā had sent her mind to Kṛṣṇa but it did not come back. The cuckoo is asked by the Gopīs to ride on an elephant and go to Mathurā. After all, what offence have the Gopīs given to Kṛṣṇa that he has entirely forgotten them? The cuckoo would tell him that his votaresses can no longer resist the pangs of his separation. Nevertheless, they sustain themselves in the hope of reunion with him. The trees and the birds etc. of Vṛndāvana are all sad in his absence. The cuckoo is to request Kṛṣṇa to give cheer to the Gopīs and to come back to Mathurā.

Pikadūta of Ambikācaraṇa Devasarmā

This poem is attributed to Ambikācaraṇa Devaśarmā who seems to be a poet of the present century. This poem has not been published so far.

The message and the theme of this work coincide with that of the *Aniladūta* of Rama Dayālu Tarkaratna.

Kokiladūta of Haridāsa

This kāvya of one hundred and three verses is attributed to Haridāsa (or Harimohana) who composed it in the Śaka era 1777. One hundred verses of it are concerned with message proper while the last three verses disclose the poet's own identity.

The theme of this work is that Kṛṣṇa has left Vṛndāvana. Rādhā is much aggrieved. She wants to convey her feelings through a *kokila*. The rest of the matter is an imitation of the dūtakāvyaś of this type.

There is no mention of the route. The poet wrote the work to show off his poetical talents. The verses are at times too difficult and abstruse and thus much of the charm of the poem is lost.

Kokilasandeśa of Veṅkaṭācārya

It is different from the *Kokilasandeśa* of Uddāṇḍa Kavi. The poem has 741 verses on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* having 60 and 61 verses in the Mandākṛāntā metre in the first and second parts respectively. The manuscript of the work is preserved in the T. M. S. S. M. Library, Tanjore. The theme of the work is :

Having enjoyed the company of sixteen thousand consorts, Viṣṇu becomes tired of Śṛṅgāra and desires to experience pathos. He becomes the king of Magadha and then under the curse of Agastya sojourns at Malayagiri. He is now separated from his wife and in a state of utter helplessness entreats a *kokila* to convey his message to his wife.

The route which the *kokila* is asked to follow runs from Malayagiri to Kusumapura. The messenger, as usual, is at the very outset eulogised and subsequently entreated to carry his message to his sweetheart. To reach Kusumapura the *kokila* is to follow a northward course and to commence its journey after paying homage to Mahendra mountain where the Malaya breezes are blowing. The messenger must have his wife to accompany him lest he (the messenger) should feel the pangs of separation like the hero. After crossing the hermitage of Agastya at Malayakūṭa the messenger is to go to Śatamakhapurī and Tāmraraṇī where the Brāhmanaṣas are highly learned. Other intermediate stages are Madhurā and the Sahya mountain where the messenger will be delighted to pay homage to Raṅganātha, Śeṣanāga and Padmanābha. The *kokila*, will then visit Tañjā Nagara, the Kāverī, the sacred river Tuṅgabhadra, and the Kṛṣṇā and then would reach Kusumapura.

The actual message is described in the second part of the work.

The poem draws inspiration from the *Meghadūta* only in form and metre but not in spirit, although the predominant sentiment is pathos here too.

Kokilasandeśa of Uddaṇḍa

The poem is written by Uddaṇḍa, the famous author of *Mallikāmāruta*. It contains 92 verses in the first part and 69 verses in the second part. The poem is an imitation of *Śukasandeśa*. The poet leaves no trace of his identity but the poet Udaya, the author of the *Mayūrasandeśa*, has mentioned Uddaṇḍa as a great favourite in the *Bālya* country. Uddaṇḍa has mentioned Chennamangalam as the destination of his messenger in *Kokilasandeśa*. This city is identified with Villarvattam. According to Malabar tradition Uddaṇḍa was a great scholar, poet and debator who kept up his rank in the

Zamorin's *Vidvatsadas* (Learned Assembly). After twelve years, the local Brahmin scholars became jealous and propitiated Durgā. With the grace of Durgā, a baby was born in the Brahmin family of Kakkasson. He grew up to be a great scholar, poet and debator. In his twelfth year he defeated Uddaṇḍa in Zamorin's *sadas*. The story of this poem runs thus :

A hero living with his beloved is taken away at night by a celestial being and is near the Conjeevaram temple. After two months, the month of Caitra approaches and he sees a kokila, through whom he sends the message to his beloved.

The route is described from Conjeevaram in the Chingleput District of the Madras State to a place called Chennamangalam (now a part of Kerala) between the two arms of the Alwaye river. The messenger is entreated to enter Malabar through Mysore (Hoysala kingdom) in the north-eastern corner. The poem closely follows Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* in technique, and is supposed to be a complement to *Śukasandeśa* of Lakṣmīdāsa in so far as it describes such portions of Malabar as are not included in that poem.

The poem is written in the usual Mandākrāntā metre.

Bhṛṅgasandeśa of Vāsudeva⁶

Malayali poets have written dūtakāvyas both in Sanskrit as well as in Malayalam⁷ on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. In this dūtakāvyā, Vāsudeva has marvellously interwoven the external nature depicted in the Pūrvabhāga with human feelings charmingly delineated in the Uttarabhāga. The number of verses is 95 and 80 in the first and second parts respectively. The poem has been published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, Trivandrum.

The theme and substance of the poem is that being charmed by the enticing beauty of a lover enjoying sound sleep in his palace, a Yakṣī had snatched him away from the bedside of his beautiful consort Balanili.⁸ But she was forced to drop him down in a flower-garden in the vicinity of Padmanābhasvāmi temple at Trivandrum, due to the chance appearance of a Yakṣa. The lover finds himself in seclusion and is perplexed at this strange turn of events. In utter dismay he begins to contemplate over his fate but the sweet hummings of a *bhṛṅga* catch his

fancy. The overwhelmed lover decides to send his message to his beloved through this *bhr̥ṅga*.

The poet here follows the conventional method of the *dūtakāvya*s. In the *Pūrva-bhāga* the route is described. The *bhr̥ṅga* is expected to travel from Trivandrum to Śvetadurga on the bank of Bharatapura, the abode of the beloved. The *Uttara-bhāga* contains the message which is expressed in a very simple style.

The poem is also known as *Bhramarasandeśa*, but the name intended by the poet was *Bhr̥ṅgasandeśa*.⁹

From Trivandrum to Śvetadurga is one month's¹⁰ journey but it is completed in two days only. The beetle is endowed with some super-natural power.¹¹ In keeping with the *dūtakāvya* tradition the poet describes some important places he has visited. According to Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī, the editor of the work, "he (the poet) has, in fact, surpassed all others by consigning all his personal experiences to the swing of poesy".

In this work the poet has mentioned the names of Śrī Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭapāda, Māṭṛdallapaṇḍita¹² and the famous astrologer Acyuta Piśārota.¹³ All these men are probably his contemporaries. The poet has also praised the ruler of Trivandrum¹⁴ who ruled over Cochin between 1563-1602 A.D. This *Sandeśakāvya* seems to have been written during that period. It sheds a welcome light on the historical and also the geographical data of that period.

Bhramarasandeśa of Mahāliṅga Śāstrī

This is a recent work written in the year 1923 A.D. by Mahāliṅga Śāstrī in *Śikharinī* metre and has one hundred and ten verses. The poet has written this poem on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. A resume of the subject-matter is :

Indra has killed Vṛtāsura. The sin of murdering a Brāhmaṇa begins to haunt him in the shape of a dreadful ghost and Indra has no other alternative but to conceal himself in the lotus-tank of the Ganges. He thus gets separated from his beloved consort Śacī and in this sad separation sends a messenger to her. A bee is entreated to carry the message to her abode, the Indrapurī.

The route runs from Jahnuḥṣetra to heaven. Himālaya, Badarikāśrama, Sthāṇvāśrama, Oṣadhiprastha, Kailāsa, Mānasa

lake and Svargaloka are the important places which the bee would like to see and enjoy during his journey.

The poem ends with the statement that by virtue of accidental pious recollections, Indra becomes purified of his sins and is released from the sin of *Brahmahatyā*. Bṛhaspati assists Indra in regaining his lost grandeur and his beloved Śacī.

The poet aims at conveying the readers the philosophy of the Purāṇas, viz. *kṣīṇe puṇye martya-lokaṃ viśanti* that men come back to the earth from the heaven when their accumulated *puṇyas* (religious merits) are exhausted and when they do some good in this world they can again be eligible for admission to the heavenly abode.

Bharamaradūta of Rudra Nyāyavācaspati

This poem is attributed to Rudra Nyāyavācaspati. The complete poem contains 125 verses. The subject matter of this work has been taken from Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* with some innovations and alterations in the route. The theme of the poem is:

Hanumat has come back to Rāma who is staying at Citrakūṭa. Rāma hears from this messenger of the pitiable plight of his wife and becomes very sad. He recollects the days which he spent in the sweet company of his wife Sītā. He can no more bear separation and this creates a grave situation. Rāma becomes the Yakṣa of the *Mehgadūta*. He is very sad. As the rainy season has arrived he thinks that all men must be with their consorts. It is just then that a *bhramara*, a bee, appears there. Rāma entreats it to convey his message to Sītā who is under confinement in Laṅkā.

The poet then explains the route. He describes once again the sad condition of Sītā. Thereafter, the message is related to the bee. The last two verses are concerned with poet's own identity, etc.

Bhṛṅgadūta of Śrīkṛṣṇa

The credit of bringing this work to light goes to S.P. Chaturvedi of Allahabad, (formerly of Nagpur). It was published in the Nagpur University Journal No. 3, December 1937. A

critique on it was published by Chaturvedi in the *Proceedings and Transactions of the All India Oriental Conference*, 6th Session, 1930, pages 623-632. We quote relevant extract from it which give quite a nice description of this hitherto unknown work.

The work contains 126 verses in Mandākrāntā metre. Unlike the *Meghadūta* there are no Pūrvabhāga and Uttarabhāga divisions in the work. All the verses form one unit, the work itself. The last stanza is in Upajāti metre and states the names of the author and the work. The theme of the dūtākāvya is :

A Gopī in feigned anger (*prāptamānāntarāyā*) quarrels with Kṛṣṇa and spends a restless night. The following morning, she sees nearby a bee humming merrily on the opening lotus flowers. With big tears in her sleep-idle eyes, she breathes a heavy sigh and asks the bee to take her message to her lover Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The way shown to the messenger is not exactly one which the messenger must follow to reach its destination. What our author aims at is to mention and describe the various scenes of *Vrajabhūmi* which are of great interest to the Gopīs and other devotees of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The bee is asked to go first to the house of Nanda (*yāhi nandasya geham*). The garden, the Mālātī-bower, scenes of amorous sports (*kāmkrīḍāparimala*), the arch—all these are admirably described. Then comes the royal avenue (*rājavīthi*), where beautiful damsels are seen hurrying to their lovers' places and heart-attracting ball-games (*kandukakrīḍāḥ*) are being played. Reaching Gokula through a spacious gate, the messenger is to see the image of Gaṇeśa in the court-yard, and the worship of Rohiṇī. He is advised to enjoy the playing on musical instruments and the amorous dance in honour of the deity. Thence he is to go to the way leading to the (river) Yamunā and listen to the witty and confidential talks of the ladies who have gone there to fetch water. He is to keep himself aloof from these temptations and proceed on his undertaken errand. Now comes the temple of *Vāgdevatā* (the goddess of speech) by whose grace even the animals can compose excellent poetic lines. This is followed by a very beautiful description of Lord Śiva's temple (*Kailāsadhāma*).

Patradūta of Rudradeva Tripāthi

This is a recent dūtakāvya¹⁵ written by Rudradeva Tripāthi, son of Ramākānta Śarmā who is described by the author as an astrologer. The work is published by Pandit Bhimadeva Tripāthi of Shri Maheshwar Printing Press, Mandsoṛe (M.P.). It consists of 37 printed pages and contains 163 verses written in the Mandākrāntā metre. At the end of the work there are five photographic reproductions of the things and places described in the work, which has elicited praise from such critics as the editor of the *Madhuravāṇī*. The theme of the work is:

The author Rudradeva Tripāthi who is living in Bombay with one of his maternal uncles, Govinda Rāma Śarmā, sends a letter to his preceptor who is also one of the maternal uncles of the author living in Daśapura in the Mālava country. The letter is sent as a messenger to convey the best regards of the pupil, the author, to the preceptor, Rāma Chandra on the Guru Pūrṇimā day. Just as the cloud in the *Meghadūta* is treated as a living being and human actions are ascribed to it, similarly our author Rudradeva Tripāthi attributes all human actions to the letter. He also describes the route to be followed by the letter which lies between Bombay and Daśapura and passes through Dadar, Balsar, Bullimore, Navasari, Bhṛgupura, Revatī and Ratnapurī, etc. In between the poet takes a few moments off and describes in vivid detail the various places and scenes of Bombay with all its beauty-spots like Chowpatti, the Juhu Beach thronged with the merry-making people helping themselves with *Bhelpūri*, etc. and the buses and the trams plying. The journey of the letter commences from the Bombay Central Post Office from where it is put in a Dakvan, carried to the Railway Station and put in a train-compartment. It is described to be a witness to all that takes place in the compartment; the breakfast by the people, the boisterous laughters of the people and the like. When the letter reaches Daśapura, it is asked to go to a Vidyālaya or a College-building where the author had pursued his studies sometime back. The letter is to deliver the message of best compliments of the pupil, the author, to the preceptor, the maternal uncle of the author.

Hānsadūta of Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāṇa

Vāmanabhaṭṭa, a Brāhmaṇa of Vatsagotra, was the court-poet of Vemabhūpāla, the famous author of *Śṛṅgārādīpikā* in the 15th century. The famous poet Bāṇa Bhaṭṭa, the court-poet of Śrī Harṣa who composed *Kādambarī* and *Harṣacarita* was also a Vatsagotra Brāhmaṇa. Bāṇa Bhaṭṭa is said to be a unique prose writer. In order to equal the fame won by him, the former wrote a large number of books including this *Hānsadūta*. The subject-matter is the same as that of the *Meghadūta*.

A Yakṣa separated from his beloved, sends a message to his beloved consort Kāndarpalekhā through a swan, who is expected to travel from Mount Malaya (the extreme south of India) to Alakā. The swan is to travel through Tāmraparṇī and reach Madurā, the land of the Pāṇḍya kings. Thereafter he is to go to Cauvery, the lands of the Rāṅgas and Colas, the Śiva temple of Puṇḍarikapura, Conjeevaram, the Pārvatī shrine at the bank of the river Kampā, and then he is to cross the river Kanakumukharī. Thereafter he is to pass through the Āndhras, the Kṛṣṇavātī, the Tuṅgabhadrā, the Godāvarī and then traverse the Vindhya mountains, and cross the rivers Yamunā and Gaṅgā and travel through Vārāṇasī, Ayodhyā, Kurukṣetra, the Himālayas, the Krauñca mountain, the mount Kailāsa and reach Alakā.

The second part of the work contains a fine description of Alakā, the abode of the Yakṣa, and his message to his beloved consort.

The work as a whole is very interesting and is closely similar to the *Meghadūta*. The poet has a thorough mastery over language and rhetoric.

Hānsadūta of Rūpagosvāmī

Rūpagosvāmī, a disciple of Śrīcāitanya, was a great Vaiṣṇava of Bengal. Besides this *Hānsadūta*, a work of 142 verses in Śikharīṇī,¹⁶ a large number of other works are his compositions. The theme of this poem is.

Lalitā, on behalf of Radhā and other cowherdesses sends a swan from Vṇḍāvana to Mathurā where Lord Kṛṣṇa resides. The swan is requested to follow the track of Kṛṣṇa's chariot

driven by Akrūra. He is further requested to have rest under the Kadamba tree behind which Kṛṣṇa used to hide himself while stealing the clothes of the Gopīs. He is also expected to visit the Govardhana mountain, a favourite resort of Kṛṣṇa, the Tamāla tree; the Kāliya lake where the Vṛndādevī had transformed herself into a Tulasī leaf, and from there to the famous town of Mathurā. The swan is to go there and see Kṛṣṇa busy in merry-making with the maidens singing songs of Vikadrū and the legendary tales narrated by Akrūra. Kṛtavarman, Satyaka, Garuḍa and others must be busy in Kṛṣṇa's service. The swan must look for an opportunity to see Kṛṣṇa when he is alone, otherwise, he would not like to hear the message sent by the village-maidens. He must request Kṛṣṇa not to forget them who were once his very near and dear ones, particularly Rādhā who cannot resist the pangs of separation any more.

The poem is rich in similes and the flight of imagination is spontaneous, although the theme is borrowed from *Śrīmad Bhāgavata*¹⁷

Hansadūta of Venkaṭanātha Vedācārya

Venkaṭanātha and his son Varadanātha are famous poets of the 14th century. They are the followers of Rāmānuja. A large number of Sanskrit and Tamil works have been written by Vedāntācārya.

The theme of this poem is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The messenger is a swan instead of Hanumān. The route which the swan is directed to follow is described. It runs from Mount Malayavat to Ceylon. The route described here is a repetition of the route described by Vāmana Bhaṭṭa Bāṇa and the poet has sufficient explanation ready for it. This path is safe and the heavy rains would not obstruct the movement of the passengers there. Hence the messenger is requested to travel through the Eastern Coast of the Madras Presidency. It is a bit longer route no doubt, but it will be free from any difficulty. The swan is expected to go to Karnāṭaka, Āndhra, Venkaṭācala, the river Kanakamukharī flowing near Añjanādri, Satyavatīkṣetra, Hastisāila at Conjeevaram situated on the northern bank of the river Vegavati, the Cola country, the Śyetaśāila, the

Candrapuṣkariṇī on the bank of which the Vṛkṣācala and the Pāṇḍyadeśa are situated. Thereafter comes the Tāmraparṇī, then the Subala mountain on the sea and finally the messenger reaches Ceylon. Sītā is found sitting under the cluster of green trees, where he conveys the message of Rāma.

The message is nothing new to us. But the poet aims at relating through an outburst of pathos, the Vedānta doctrines and philosophy only in a new garb. However, the poet has tried to make this poem attractive by the beauty of his composition. He saves it from becoming a dull and monotonous song.

Hansasandēśa of Raghunāthadāsa

The theme of the work is exactly the same as that of the *Hansasandēśa* of Rūpagosvāmī. Generally the dūtakāvyas show the route first and then the message is conveyed but here the case is reverse. The poet relates the message in the first half of the poem and the second half contains the route. The theme is as follows :

Rādhā, the chief cowherdess cannot stand the pangs of separation from Kṛṣṇa. She deposes Lalitā, her trusted friend, to convey her message to Kṛṣṇa, who is living in Mathurā. The messenger is requested to describe the day-by-day worsening plight of the Gopīs. Kṛṣṇa has deserted them and this has made them miserable. Every month that passes brings fresh pain and agony. Their condition thus is getting from bad to worse.

They want nothing from Kṛṣṇa except a sweet and kind glance towards them failing which, they may not be able to keep their body and soul together.

Hansasandēśa of Pūrṇasarasvatī

The poem is written on the model of the *Meghadūta* with this difference that herein the message is being sent by the beloved to the lover. The story goes that once a maiden of Kāñcīpura saw Lord Kṛṣṇa going out for a festival. She was charmed by his beauty but since he was residing at Vṛndāvana the poor beloved could not tolerate his separation. In utter confusion and dismay she sent a message to him. A swan was the messenger. The route from Kāñcī to Vṛndāvana is described

in a very nice way.

The poet seems to have lived sometime between the 12th and the 16th centuries.

Haṁsasandeśa (anonymous)

The poem is in line with the other dūtakāvyas, so far as the Mandākrāntā metre is concerned but in the subject matter it differs. The work is mainly concerned with Yoga and Vedānta. The complete poem consists of 101 verses and is divided into two parts having 50 and 51 verses respectively in the Pūrvasandeśa and the Uttarasandeśa. The theme is:

A devotee transforms his soul into a swan and sends it to *Rudrabhakti* i.e. 'Devotion to Śiva'. Due to wordly engagements he remains away from his beloved, the *Bhakti* (Devotion). He, therefore, sets aside the wordly attachments and through his *Karma* regains his consciousness along with his beloved *Bhakti* (Devotion).

Śukasandeśa of Lakṣmīdāsa

This small poem is attributed to one Nambudiri Brāhmaṇa Lakṣmīdāsa of Karinnampilly, a small vilage situated on the bank of the Alwaye river (in modern Travancore). He seems to have flourished in the 13th century. The poem is composed on the model of the *Meghadūta*. The message is sent through a parrot from Rāmeśvaram to Trikkanamattilakam near Cranganur. It is one of the most important cities of the ancient Malabar kings. On his way, the messenger is to pass through Comorin and Trivandrum.

It is a nice lyric piece of one hundred and sixty two stanzas (having 73 and 89 verses in the first and second parts respectively). The hero is living in happiness in the sweet company of his beloved. In a dream he finds himself suddenly transported to Rāmeśvaram or Rāmasetu, the famous pilgrim-centre in South India. He then sees a parrot to whom he ascribes human organs, feelings and supernatural intelligence and through it sends his message to his wife at Guṇapuram.

It is a very interesting work but the message and the feeling of separation both take place in a dream.

Kīradūta of Rāmagopāla

This poem of 104 verses has been written by Rāmagopāla who is one of the scholars who composed *Vivādārṇavasetu* under the patronage of Rājā Kṛṣṇacandra of Navadvīpa.

The theme of this poem is the same as that of the other poems dealing with Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs' love-affair. The messenger is a parrot who surely is the proper agency to convey the feelings and emotions of the Gopīs to Kṛṣṇa.

Kokasandēśa of Viṣṇutrāta

Viṣṇutrāta was a Malabar poet who flourished in the 16th century. He lived in the village named Vazappilli. This poem contains 120 and 196 verses in the first and the second parts respectively in Mandākrāntā metre. The poet has followed the traditional method of the dūtakāvyas. The first part contains the description of the route to be followed in its travels by the messenger and the second part gives the message which is to be conveyed to the beloved.

A prince of Śrīvihārapura is being abducted by some unknown powerful magicians and taken away to a far off place. The prince does not know as to where he is and what has happened to him. He is much confused in a lonely place, and is not able to discover the identity of that place. He recollects the days spent in merry-making and then he thinks of the condition of his beloved wife. The bewilderment at that is acute. In this sad plight the lover sees a *koka* flying there whom he requests to take his message to Kāmārāma, where his beloved lives. The *koka* goes to the beloved and tells her of the pangs of separation felt by the hero.

The poem is the longest one in the whole of the dūtakāvya literature in Sanskrit.

Cakorasandēśa of Perusūri

It is a fine love-lyric which in essence follows the *Meghadūta*. The poet seems to have adorned the court of a king in Southern India, who had perhaps conferred upon him the title of *Navīna Patañjali* since the poet in the colophon calls himself so. The work is preserved as a fragment. The first part of the poem having 69 verses is complete in itself except a few

omissions, but the second part having 40 verses is incomplete. Verses 9 to 20 are found intact while all the remaining verses have a lacuna.

The theme of the work is that a certain lover did not pay due respect to Vyāghrapāda while he went to bow before Sundareśa. The former cursed him and the poor lover had to sojourn at Kailāsa mountain. Only a month before the expiry of his term of curse, the lover sent a *cakora* through whom he sent his message to his beloved. The message, unlike in other Kāvya, is not verbal, but written on a tree bark with mineral dyes. The first part describes the journey from Kailāsa to Hāla (the present Madhurā) the capital town of the Pāṇḍya country in the extreme south of India. The second part contains the message which is however incomplete.

This historical value of the first part is considerable, as there are descriptions of every important town, river and temple on the way. The second part (incomplete) describes the place where the beloved lives.

In the available part the author shows great qualities of literary craftsmanship and striking originality. His conceits are not usually laboured, and the chiselled and bejewelled phraseology gives an impression of rare beauty. The work can be ranked as an excellent production in the entire dūtakāvya literature.

Mayūrasandeśa by Udaya

Prince Udaya was the famous author of Kaumudī, a commentary on the *locana* on the *Dhavyāloka* of Ānandvardhana. This work is written on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. It contains 107 and 92 verses in the Pūrva and the Uttarabhāgas respectively.

The message is sent by a person named Śrīkaṇṭha of Syānandūra (modern Trivandrum) to his consort residing at Annakara, a small village in Cochin State.

The distance to be travelled is eight miles only. A peacock is the messenger for this job. The route is described in a very simple style. There is a lot on the way to attract the attention of the messenger. The Uttarabhāga contains the message. The lover explains his sad condition due to his separation from his beloved

wife.

The work is a nice imitation of two or three works of the South Indian poets namely, the *Śukasandeśa*, the *Kokilasandeśa* and the *Unnihilisandeśa* (Malayalam Kāvya). All of the three works are drawn upon but the presentation is the author's own. He has woven the material drawn from the three *dūtakāvyas* into an artistic whole. In that lies his novelty. The poem is rich in nice descriptions of some of the most important towns of South India. The style is very simple but the method of narration is not very appealing.

Kākadūta of Gauragopāla Siromaṇi

This was composed by Gauragopāla in 1811 Śaka year. Its theme is the same as that of the *Aniladūta*. Herein the message is sent by the cowherdresses to Kṛṣṇa.

The poet does not like to rely upon the messengers engaged by other poets. They have used Cloud, Swan, Wind and so on to deliver their messages but he criticizes such *dūtas* and in a large number of verses argues the superiority of *Kāka* to other *dūtas*. In his opinion only the *Kāka* is the fittest agency of *daūtya-karma* (conveyance of messages).

Unlike the other writers in the field, this poet does not worry much about the message of the messenger. He even does not care for the Gopīs. That is why he has failed to convey their message to Kṛṣṇa.

The poet seems to have composed this work to show off his skill in grammar and command of vocabulary.

Bakadūta of MM. Ajitanātha Nyāyaratna

Ajitanātha of Nadia is the author of this poem. Unfortunately only a fragmentary copy of this work is available. The poem is written in different metres. The route to be covered by the messenger runs from Kṛṣṇanagara of Navadvīpa.

Due to the absence of the initial part, the theme of this work cannot be made out with certainty but from the available stanzas one can gather that some Bhramarī whose husband is away sends her message through a *Baka*.

Bhramarī is perhaps some heroine deserted by her lover who in utter sorrow seeks to convey her feelings to the lover.

She asks him to think of her pitiable condition and come back to her.

It is a good love-lyric and the poet seems to be at his best here.

Śunakadūta by K.M. Kṛṣṇamūrti Śarmā

This small Sandeśakāvya of 30 verses in Mandākrāntā metre has been composed by K. B. Kṛṣṇamūrti Śarmā of Deccan College Research Institute, Poona. The work was published in 1954 A.D. in the quarterly Sanskrit magazine *Sārasvatī Suśamā* in the year 2011 of the Vikrama era. The theme of the poem is:

Intending to present an ornament to his beloved who is the daughter of his maternal uncle, a lover breaks into the house of a rich man and steals some gold but is caught red-handed and is awarded one year's imprisonment. He is feeling sad but he cannot escape from that stone-built jail. He, in utter helplessness calls upon a dog whom he pleases *with a base sweet cake* and entreats it to convey his feeling to his beloved consort who is residing at Mahiṣanagara¹⁸, at a distance of six miles to the west of that jail. The lover further instructs the dog to go through a village having the Viṭṭhala temple. The message is intended to console the beloved for some time till the lover reaches there.

The jail term expires. The lover earns some money by business, purchases gold bangles and offers these to his beloved. The poem ends with a happy reunion of the two lovers.

It is written in a very nice style on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. The poet mentions this fact in his last verse.

Uddhavadūta of Mādhavakavīndra

Uddhavadūta, a nice poem of 141 verses is attributed to Mādhavakavīndra of Talitanagara, who composed it on the pattern of the other dūtakāvyas. The entire poem is written in the Māndākrāntā metre.

The theme of this work is only an elaboration of the idea found in a verse of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* wherein Kṛṣṇa sends Uddhava as a messenger to his parents and Gopīs residing at Vṛndāvana.

This poem begins with an enquiry about a stranger who visits the Gopīs. The Gopīs soon come to know that Uddhava

is a messenger sent by Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He brings a message for Gopīs who without hearing him abruptly begin to describe their own miserable condition due to their separation from their friend. Under an emotional stress one of the cowherdesses becomes senseless. Uddhava tries to bring her to senses. He is perplexed to note that he cannot deliver the message to the Gopīs who instead start cutting jokes with him and ask him to convey their message to Kṛṣṇa. Finally Uddhava tells Rādhā (the Gopī who fainted) that he has come with a message from Kṛṣṇa.

The messenger appreciates Rādhā's devotion to Kṛṣṇa.

Uddhavasandeśa of Rūpagosvāmin

This poem was composed by a celebrated scholar named Rūpagosvāmin in the 16th century. It adopts the Mandākrāntā metre. The entire poem consists of one hundred and thirty eight verses.

The subject-matter of this work is the same as that of the *Uddhavadūta* with slight variations. Kṛṣṇa persuades his friend Uddhava to convey his message to Gopīs residing at Vṛndāvana. The route from Mathurā to Vraja is related with a vivid description of some important things worth seeing on the way. Kṛṣṇa sends his best wishes for his friends and pays homage to his parents.

The poem gives an account of some sacred places, rivers, centres of pilgrimage and thus is very useful to trace out the geographical conditions in the contemporary period. The poet also gives a true history of the important towns flourishing in his time.

Uddhavadūta of Rājavallabha Miśra

The credit for bringing to light this hitherto unknown dūtakāvya belongs to Pandit Baladeva Upādhyāya, formerly of the Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi. He has published a beautiful critique on this work which was published in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XII. 1936. We quote below some excerpts from it pertaining to the author of the work, its theme and literary excellence.

The author of this dūtakāvya is Rājavallabha Miśra who has also written upon it a useful commentary....The kāvya was

finished on the fifth day of the bright fortnight in the month of Āśvina (Sept.-Oct.) in the Vikrama year 1889, i.e., 1832 A.D..

The poem consists of 115 verses in all. The last two verses written in Anuṣṭubh metre give the date of the composition and describe the object of the work. The remaining 83 verses are chiefly concerned with the theme which is taken from the life of Kṛṣṇa, a constant source of inspiration to poets. The poem opens with Uddhava seated under the *Kadamba* tree and surrounded by the young Gopīs of Vṛndāvana. The ladies naturally become exceedingly pleased to find the friend of their dear Kṛṣṇa and take the opportunity to give vent to their pent-up feelings of deep anguish at the indifference of their once most beloved companion and begin to shower bitter reproaches on the familiar scenes and objects of the Vṛndā groves. The Gopī's lament begins in verse 3 and extends upto the 16th verse. The reproaches are directed at first to the mount Govardhana (3), to the cuckoo (4-5), to the cloud (6-8), to the river Yamunā (9), to the black bee (10), to the animals of the forest like the deer and peacock (11), to the mango tree (12) and lastly to the Vṛndāvana itself which was once the scene of their confidential talks and meandering walks. This will of the ladies moves Uddhava who is deeply pained at finding the love of the Gopīs disregarded by his own companion. He gives them the message of true and novel love which in spite of physical separation, always gets fixed and greatly developed under such trying circumstances (19).

After this Uddhava returns to Mathurā where he gives a full and glowing description of the noble sentiments of the Vraja Gopīs and the deep agony of their heart due to cold indifference shown to them by him. This speech of Uddhava forms the main body of this poem and extends from 21st to 82nd verse. The description of Gopīs' condition has its desired effect on Kṛṣṇa's mind, who is deeply touched (83). With this the poem comes to an end.

The author has achieved notable success in placing before his readers his own conception of true love and in describing the noble emotions of the human heart when separated from a person who is truly lovable.

Pānthadūta of Bholānātha

This small work has been composed by a modern poet named Bholānātha of Tikuri. It has 105 verses in Śārdūlavik-rīḍita metre with the exception of the two¹⁹ which are in the Vasantatilakā metre. Two verses, i.e. 63 and 64 have been found incomplete and verse 104 is altogether missing. The work is published in the *Prācyavāṇī Sanskrit Series*, Calcutta.

The poet commences the work with a *maṅgalaśloka*²⁰, enunciating the philosophy of the *Gītā*.²¹ It would thus appear that he is an adherent of Vaiṣṇavism. Generally the dūtakāvyas are written in two parts, the first part giving the route, and the second the message but this poem is an exception, as the poet starts with the message abruptly after the benedictory verse. The theme of the work is as follows :

Srīkṛṣṇa leaves Vṛndāvana and sojourns at Mathurā. He does not send news of his whereabouts. Nor does he send a message to the cowherdresses of Vraja with whom he has been playing throughout his childhood and whose sweet company he has been enjoying. Once Rādhā goes to the river Yamunā,²² and sees its blue waters. She loses her senses when she remembers Kṛṣṇa's absence, but comes to herself when her friends sprinkle fresh water of the holy river on her face. At the same time the Gopīs catch sight of a traveller bound for Mathurā through whom they like to send their message. They entreat him to tell Kṛṣṇa that it does not behove him to forget them altogether although he has spent his childhood days in the company of the sweet maidens of Mathurā. They are in a very miserable plight and Durgā stands witness to this fact. The Gopīs remark that Kṛṣṇa has perchance, lost his sense and sensibility since he has sucked Pūtana's²³ milk. He should follow the example of Śiva who is of the form of Ardhanārīśvara. Kṛṣṇa is definitely a cunning²⁴ lover, a hypocrite²⁵, and really the son of rustic parents.²⁶ One of the Gopīs continues to censure him²⁷ till at last she falls on the ground²⁸ senseless. Another Gopī then continues the thread saying that Kujā and Kṛṣṇā and Kṛṣṇa are both crooked and Fate has skilfully made a fit match although Kujā cannot compare with Rādhā's feet. ²⁹ Kṛṣṇa is a murderer³⁰ of womenfolk³¹ and a cowherd.³² He has attained

a high rank only with the divine power so kindly bestowed upon him by Yaśodā, but he must not boast of his valour since the same mother who fed him on her milk has withdrawn her affection from him. After killing Kaṁsa he has enthroned Ugrasena clearly with a motive to carouse with his handsome maidens; and he is liable to be punished for this act.

Finally Rādhā declares that he is her only resort and that she is entirely devoted to him. Her only prayer is that she should remain his lovable consort in all the future births that she may have.

The idea of the poet as it would appear from the theme detailed above, is to propagate Viṣṇubhakti through this small love-lyric.

Gopīdūta by Lambodara Vaidya

Lambodara Vaidya appears to be a court-poet of the modern times. He enjoyed the patronage of a Rājā named Jagaddurlabha. The poem has not been published so far. In essentials it is similar to the other dūtakāvyas with the Kṛṣṇa-Gopī theme.

The message is being sent by the cowherdesses to Kṛṣṇa whom they see when he is going in his chariot. The dust raised by the high speed of the chariot falls in their eyes. The cowherdesses feel hurt and all of them fall senseless. After a time they send a messenger to convey their feelings towards their Lord.

Nemidūta of Vikrama

Vikrama, the author of the *Nemidūta* was the son of Asaṅga. He lived at Khambhat (Gujarat). Ṛṣabhadāsa, a celebrated poet in Gujarat was his brother. The last line in each stanza in this work is taken from the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa. The poem begins with the message. No route is mentioned herein.

The first chapter contains a description of Nemināth's pleasures and activities in his boyhood. The second chapter describes the Vasanta or the spring season and the pleasures of the hero in that pleasant season. The third chapter gives a description of the marriage preparation of the hero. The last chapter contains a description of the grave and the sad state of

Rājamātā, and the beloved consort of the hero, who sends her message to him asking him to abandon the idea of becoming a recluse.

The poem aims at placing before the readers the virtues of the Jaina Dharma.

Manodūta of Indreśa Bhaṭṭa

This small poem of 45 verses in different metres is attributed to one Indreśa of Gokula who flourished towards the end of the 18th century. He belongs to the Vallabhācārya school.

The poet Indreśa sends his mind from Mathurā to Dvārakā where Kṛṣṇa resides. The route is described in the same style as in the other dūtakāvya. The messenger is to go to Jaipur, Kotah, Kartarpur, Udaipur and such other places and reach Dvārakā. On the way it is to have the much sought for *darśana* of Kṛṣṇa in various forms. The mind is entreated to go to Kṛṣṇa and request him to call the poet to stay with him. The poem is written in a beautiful style.

Hṛdayadūta of Harihara Bhaṭṭa

Harihara Bhaṭṭa, the author of the *Hṛdayadūta* was a famous Vaiṣṇava of the Vallabhācārya school. He was born in a village named Devarṣigrāma (modern Deoria) near about the year 1560 of the Vikrama era.

Generally the dūtakāvya are found in Mandākrāntā metre but this poem is written in Vasantatilakā except the last verse which is in Sragdharā.

It is an excellent devotional poem. The subject-matter is the message sent by the poet to Śrīkṛṣṇa. The poet's own heart is the messenger. The route to be followed by the *dūta* runs from Prayāga to Mathurā. The poet aims at giving expression to his own thoughts through the medium of a dūtakāvya and he criticises the Vāmamārga while he appreciates the Dakṣiṇamārga in the *Nirguṇa viśiṣṭamārga* of Śrī Vallabhācārya. There are some verses in which original ideas have been expressed in a beautiful language. The poet has made a successful attempt to fashion the dry bones of philosophy and religion into a throbbing body with a glorious kāvya-soul full

of inspiration and sentiment. The message commences after verse 104. The messenger is asked to request Lord Kṛṣṇa to allow him a place in his lotus-like feet.

Manodūta of Trailaṅga Vajranātha

This poem of 102 verses in Śikhariṇī is written by Vajranātha who composed it in the year 1758 at Vṛndāvana. The poet adopts for his theme the famous episode of gambling in the court of the Kauravas at Hastināpura and the insult of Draupadī.

The poem begins with some benedictory verses. From the 11th verse onwards six verses are devoted to the visit of Duryodhana to Pāṇḍavas' *yajña*. The Kuru king is amazed at the strange palace of the Pāṇḍavas who laughed at him. He comes back deeply sad and tells Śakuni the cause of his sorrow, who after consulting him prepares a scheme of playing dice with Yudhiṣṭhira who is not so experienced in it. The trap is laid to deprive him of his richer empire and even Draupadī. The scheme is put into operation and it achieves the desired result. Draupadī is dragged into the court by Duṣṣāśana.

The real dūtakāvya commences from verse 133 where Draupadī in a state of utter helplessness asks her own mind to go to Dvārakā and request Kṛṣṇa to come and help. Kṛṣṇa hurries up and furnishes *sāris* of multifarious designs and thus saves her from a grave situation. The poem ends in praise of Viṣṇu worship which is the only path to achieve eternal peace.

The poem is labyrinth of a queer type where the poet, while describing the court of Yudhiṣṭhira, is busy with demonstrating his knowledge of and skill in astrology, medicine, military science, architecture, mīmāṃsā, grammar, etc. But the work is not lacking in rhetorical excellence. Qualities of composition such as anuprāsa, cohesion, lucidity and pregnancy of expression are found throughout the work. The figures of speech have enriched and embellished the composition. Few poets could be so talented as the author. Though modelled on the *Meghadūta* this dūtakāvya, is, as a matter of fact, least indebted to it.

Manodūta of Viṣṇudāsa

Viṣṇudāsa, one of the best known poets of Bengal flourished

in the 15th century. He was the saint-poet closely related to Caitanyadeva. He composed this poem of 101 stanzas in order to convey his feelings to the common people. The message and the messenger are both super-human. The theme of this work is as follows :

After having studied the sacred books like the Purāṇas the poet feels that one must fully devote oneself to penance and worship. In the beginning the poet thinks of his own deeds and then makes up his mind to seek refuge in Viṣṇu's worship. His own mind is the messenger whom he tells the route and the charm of the *Viṣṇubhakti*. He asks the messenger to go through Gokula, Yamunā, Vṛndāvana and reach Kṛṣṇa. In the end he explains his message of atonement and longing for Bhakti in order to attain emancipation.

Manodūta of Rāmaśarmā

Only a fragmentary copy of this work is available with the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad, Calcutta. From the colophon of this poem we gather that the work is a messenger-poem written in a very simple style though it is not free from some minor lapses which confuse the sense and mar the beauty of some of the stanzas. The theme of the work is :

The poet is a great scholar having complete faith in and true devotion to Kṛṣṇa. He is absorbed in *Bhakti*. In his contemplative mood he experiences a catechism, a discussion in question and answer-form, between the mind and a Dvija. The mind and the Dvija discuss the *Viṣṇubhakti*. The Dvija requests the mind to convey his message to Kṛṣṇa to be kind to his devotees. The Dvija reveals some noble virtues of the mind while conveying its message to Kṛṣṇa.

Śīladūta of Caritrasundaragaṇi

It is a fine poem composed by a learned Jaina poet named Caritrasundaragaṇi having 131 verses in Śikhariṇī metre. The method adopted by the poet is very attractive and simple. He has interwoven the last line of each verse of the *Meghadūta* in all of his stanzas. The story runs as follows :

Prince Sthūlabhadra was enjoying his days in the sweet company of his beloved wife Kośā. Feeling very sad due to the

sudden demise of his father, he abstains from the sensuous pleasures and abruptly brushes aside all the wordly attachments. He considers all the wealth, and the relations etc. to be debasing objects and observes celibacy. As a recluse he sojourns with a saint named Bhadrabāhu, his venerable Guru.

Kośā, his devoted consort, in utter despair requests him to remain with her. She tries to attract him by narrating the charms and the pleasures of life. She suggests him to stay in his own capital where he has a very nice pleasure hill and a temple built by his predecessors with great labour and carry on with his worship there. But by dint of his forceful arguments and his noble character the saint at last moulds his wife to accept the path of emancipation. In the end she also leaves her home and becomes a true votary of her husband and embraces Jainism.

The object of the poet is to propagate the canons and the virtues of the Jaina religion.

Vānmaṇḍanagunadūta of Vīreśvara

This work is attributed to Vīreśvara. This poem is written in the Śārdūlavikrīḍita except the last verse which is in Mālinī. The total number of verses is 201.

Unlike other dūtakāvyas which are generally Virahakāvyas, this work is written in a different style and with a different motive. The subject-matter of the work is :

The poet longs to win the sympathy and patronage of a king named Bhīmasena, and sends him his own poetic quality as a messenger, though as an intermediary, a learned Brāhmaṇa is engaged for this work. The Gunadūta is to go from Rāgapura to Kālībhatti (in Māyāpura) and complete the journey in five days. The Gunadūta, *en route* to the place of destination, passes the first night at Maṇḍapa village, the second with Navīsariha, and the third at Prātaśvenapura. The fourth night is to be spent under the magnanimous hospitality of Omkāra of Cārava and his younger brother Rāmaji. On the last day before the messenger reaches Kālībhatti, he is to relate the message of the poor poet first to Daśaratha, the royal priest, and then under his advice and by his benign grace to King Bhīmasena.

The poet is a great grammarian and a perfect master of Sanskrit poetics. He has created his own independent theme

and is under least obligation to his predecessors.

Bhaktidūta of Kālīprasāda

This small poem having 23 stanzas has been composed by a modern Pandit named Kālīprasāda.

It deals with the way to emancipation. The message is sent through *Bhakti* (devotion).

Tulasīdūta of Trilocana

Tulasīdūta, a love-lyric of 55 verses is attributed to Trilocana who composed it in 1933 Vikrama era, i.e., 1805 A.D.

Like some other dūtakāvya the *Tulasīdūta* is also written on Kṛṣṇa and Gopī's love-affairs. Kṛṣṇa has gone to Madhopur and the cowherdresses sit together and discuss among themselves this desertion. They see a Tulasī plant in the garden through which they choose to convey their feelings to Kṛṣṇa. The last twenty verses are concerned with the message which the Tulasī plant is requested to convey.

The poet has not described the route to be followed by the messenger but this is definitely said that it is not to go all by itself. The Gopīs send two guards to escort their messenger. One is the sandalwood fragrance and the second is their own *Bhakti*. The Gopīs request the messenger to relate their message to Kṛṣṇa when he is all alone and in seclusion and not when he is thirsty, hungry or going to bed.

Padmadūta of Siddhanātha Vidyāvāgiśa

Padmadūta is a poem of 62 verses by Siddhanātha in Mandākrāntā metre. The theme of the poem is :

Sītā is in confinement at Laṅkā. She is suffering from the pangs of separation. To her good luck she, through some reliable source, hears that Rāma is building a bridge over the sea and will reach Laṅkā as soon as it is completed.

The news blazes the dimly flickering love-candle and Sītā gets very sad. She cannot stay without her husband but she is helpless. Fortunately she sees a *padma* (lotus). She requests it to convey her feelings to Rāma.

The poet is a Naiyāyika. The philosophical and even the autobiographical portions of this work make a difficult reading. The work has not been commented upon so far.

The poem is also a strange riddle. The first 12 verses deal with objects which arouse the passion of the heroine. Then one verse describes the *dūta-darśana*. A number of verses are devoted merely to the praise of the lotus. Then follows a description of the virtues of the hero and his courageous deeds. It is only in the last verse that the reader comes to know of the message.

There is no mention of the route followed by the messenger.

Pādapadūta of Gopendranātha

This poem is attributed to Gopendranātha of Navadvīpa.

The poet reveals that Śrī Gaurāṅga has gone to Nilaśaila. His dear wife is suffering from the pangs of separation. She wants to convey her feelings to Śrī Gaurāṅga through a *nimba* tree growing in her courtyard. The messenger is to travel from Navadvīpa to Śrīkṣetra via Nadia state, Śāntipura, Trivenī, Sundaravana, Bay of Bengal, Vaitaraṇī river and such other places.

Mudgaradūta of Rāmāvatāra Śarmā

This is a modern work written by a learned scholar. It is a parody of 148 verses having digs at modern society. Mūrkhadeva (a stupid) does not believe in having a progeny since his father will serve the purpose of his son. Mūrkhadeva, therefore, observes celibacy and abstinence and is to live in the Rāmagiri Āśramas. For him even the mortal frames of learned scholars are unchaste. He sends a messenger to his 'widow' wife to tell her of his own state. The route for the messenger is very long. The messenger goes to New York, Victoria Terminus, Persian Gulf, Red Sea, France, Switzerland, the Mediterranean Sea, Egypt, Italy, Gibraltar, Spain and so on.

The poem is very interesting and offers a well-considered criticism of all the evils prevailing in the modern Hindu society. The poet follows the traditional method of the dūtakāvyas and interweaves phrases and lines from the *Meghadūta* into different stanzas of his work.

Padāṅkadūta of Śrīkrṣṇa Sārvabhauma

This small poem contains 46 verses in the Mandākrāntā metre. It was composed at the instance of King Raghurāma

Rāya who ruled over Bengal in the beginning of the 17th century. The poet was a famous scholar of the time and wrote a large number of other works of vital importance. The theme of the work is :

Rādhā is feeling sad since Kṛṣṇa left for Mathurā. The pangs of separation are daily becoming acute, and the Gopīs consider his stay at Vṛndāvana to be a tragedy. Kṛṣṇa had promised to come back soon to the Gopīs but now it appears that it was only a hoax. Gopīs send their 'mind' as a messenger but it does not turn up. Desire, on account of its heavy weight cannot serve the purpose of Gopīs. The Gopīs, therefore, decide to send the foot-print of Kṛṣṇa as a messenger and ask it to go to Mathurā or Gokula wherever Kṛṣṇa may be found.

The messenger is requested to go to their cunning lover and entreat him to come back failing which Rādhā would die.

The main interest of the work lies in the appropriate use of the Nyāyaparibhāṣās for conveying poetic concepts.

Ghaṭakarpara-Yamaka-Kāvya

Ghaṭakarpara holds a high position among the poets of Sanskrit. He is considered to be one of the nine gems of the court of Yaśodharmadeva Vikramāditya, and a contemporary of Kālidāsa.

Although this *Yamakakāvya* consists of 23 verses only, it is fine specimen of Sandeśakāvya. The difference between the *Meghadūta* and this kāvya is that here the message is being sent by a lady to her lover. The messenger is the same in both the works. The time of sending the message is the rainy season but the duration of separation is different. The lady suffers a month's separation while Kālidāsa's Yakṣa full one year's.

The poem begins with the description of the rainy season (the first six verses). The following six verses are addressed to the cloud. Then the lady narrates the message in some verses followed by others which are her own soliloquy. The last two verses give the poet's own identity, etc.

The poem has won appreciation of a large number of learned scholars like Śaṅkara, Vidyānātha, Divākara and Abhinavagupta.

Geographical Importance of the Dūtakāvya

The dūtakāvya are modelled on the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa which they faithfully following and large its structure and do not usually omit its essential points. As Kālidāsa has shown the route which the cloud had to follow in its movement from Rāmagiri to Alakāpurī, the authors of the dūtakāvya too, (some of them of course) were not found wanting in the mention of the routes to be followed by their respective *dūtas*. As these poets have gone in for all kinds of different *dūtas* so they have described different routes too with the result that they throw a flood of light on the geography and the topography of the country in the different periods during which the dūtakāvya continued to be produced in its various parts. We may mentioned below some of the dūtakāvya and the routes shown in them.

Meghadūta of Kālidāsa

Journey : Rāmagiri—Alakā

Route : Rāmagiri—the plateau of Māla—Mount Amrakūṭa—river Narmadā—Daśārṇa country—Vidiśā on the river Vetravati—rivers Sindhu and Nirvindhyā—the country of Avanti—Ujjayinī—the stream Gambhīrā—Devagiri hill—the river Carmanvatī—the region of Daśapura—the country of Brahmāvarta and Kurukṣetra—the river Sarasvatī—Kanakhala—the Mānasa Lake—the Mount Kailāsa—the city of Alakā.

Hansadūta of Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāṇa

Journey: Malaya range—Alakā

Route : Malaya range (Travancore range)—Tāmrparṇī—Madurā—Kāverī—Śrīraṅgam—Cola country—Aruṇcala—Kāñci—Kāla-hasti-mandira—Kanakamukharī (river)—Tūṅgabhadra

Page not type 136, 137, 138

References

1. Vallabhadeva (10th century) has 11 verses; Mallinātha (14th century) has 121 verses; Dakṣiṇāvartanātha (12th century) 110 verses; Pūṇasarasvatī 110 verses; Tibetan version of Meghadūta 117 verses;

Panabokke (Ceylonese version) 118 verses; India Office Manuscript of Meghadūta 110 verses; V.S. Agrawala edition, 115 verses; C.S.R. Sastri 115 verses. (He has also given a separate list of 5 ślokas which he considers to be interpolated.) Vidvan G. J. Somayaji, Madras 124 verses; K. B. Pathak 120 verses; Sthiradeva 112 verses; Vasanta Ramachandra Nerurkar, Bombay 118 verses (He have given 9 verses separately which he considers to be spurious.) J. B. Chaudhury, Calcutta, 114 verses.

2. MS. No. 5003, 11 pages, 26 verses, V. V. R. I., Hoshiarpur.
3. (verse 101)
4. (verse 102)
5. (verse 14)
6. Sandese'smin katham api guru Śrīpadāmbhoja- yugmadhyāna dhvasta prabalatamsā Vāsudevena baddhe.
7. For instance *Mayūrasandēśa*, *Kokilasandēśa* etc.
8. Verses 1 and 2. 5. Verses 5 and 49. 6. Verse 17.
9. Verse 6.
10. Verse 91. 9. Verse 89. 10. Verse 25.
11. Published in Saṁvat 2012
12. Some editions contain 101 verses only.
13. It is only an imaginary name.
14. Verse 102, 103;
15. Verse No. 1 and 2;
16. *Yadā Yadā Hi Dharmasya..... Gītā*;
17. (X—41, 57).
18. Verse
19. Verse 20;
20. Verse 21;
21. Verse 22;
22. Verse 23;
23. Verse 24-30.
24. Verse 3, 31;
25. Verse 35;
26. Verse 38;
27. Verse 40;
28. Verse 42.

The Anyoktis in the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa

Of the figures of speech *Anyokti* is one which some of the most interesting examples are to be met with in the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa. *Anyokti* is an indirect way of saying things which is nevertheless effective. There are occasions when we do not want to say something directly to a person. It may be discourteous, may wound his vanity, may provoke his anger and embitter our relations with him. Similarly if some pleasant references are made to a person at his very face it may tantamount to a crude form of sycophancy. To avoid this, a resort is made to the poetical device called *Anyokti*. Here some other thing, may-be a bird, a tree or for that matter any kind of natural phenomenon is employed as a medium through which the poet expresses his feelings. It is not this some other thing directly addressed and spoken of that is meant. It is another person who is in reality addressed and sought to be described. The oblique way of saying things has been very popular with Sanskrit poets. Sanskrit literature abounds in some of the finest *Anyoktis* which for their charm and appeal remain unrivalled. The *Anyoktis* of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha have become a household word in the Sanskrit world. Since ages the *Anyokti* form of poetry has caught the imagination of the people and the poets have been taking special delight in it. They have been taking to this form of writing even for the purpose of developing a point or enunciating a principle. It is for this purpose that a large number of *Anyoktis* have been written in Sanskrit. There are quite a good number of them written for another purpose too, viz., for praising the kings of patrons and for deriding them. In the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa it is the latter variety of *Anyoktis* which is generally met with. There are, especially in the second half of the Nirvāṇapra karaṇa, some of the finest *Anyoktis*, a few dealing with cuckoos, crows and other birds and a few others dealing with miscellaneous things. Some of the finest

examples of the *Ānyoktis* in the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* are given below :

*kiṁ kiṁ kokila kūjasi drutravaṁ harṣāt samullāsitaṁ
grīvākoṭarataḥ praveśaya punar mā bhūc ciraṁ te bhramaḥ
uddāmaiḥ kusumair nirantaratarāṁ nedaṁ madhor jṛmbhitāṁ
hemantena kṛtās tuṣāranikaraiḥ śuṣkā amī pādapārḥ. 11*

“O cuckoo, why are you crying aloud with joy? Your cooings you should withdraw to the cavity of your throat. Do not be under an illusion for long. This is not the advent of the spring season which is characterized by the thickness of the wildly growing flowers. These trees have been made dry by winter by its masses of snow.”

In the above example a cuckoo is asked to stop its cooings for it is winter and not spring. The implication here is that there is a time and a place even for the sweetest expressions, such as the warbling of a cuckoo and that one should not go on telling the non-receptive audience of one's qualities and attainments etc. in a moment of excitement. When the people around are in no mood to listen or are otherwise not interested, one should better keep quiet and not waste one's breath; for words uttered inopportunely may not only be tasteless, but also distasteful. The same idea has been expressed in the following very interesting *Anyokti* :

*bhrātāḥ kokila kūjitair alam alam nāyāty anarghyo guṇas
lūṣṇīm āssva viśr̥ṇaparnapaḥalacchanne kvacit koṭare ।
uddāmadrumakandare kaṭuraṭatkākāvalīsaṁkulāḥ
kālo 'yam śīśirasya samprati sakhe nāyam vasantotsavaḥ 12*

“O brother cuckoo ! stop your cooing. (For) hereby you do not acquire a precious quality. Keep mum (lying) some where in a hollow (of a tree) covered with a layer of withered leaves, in the recesses of the lofty trees. Of friend, this is not the festival of spring. It is the time of winter, full of rows of crows producing jarring notes.”

In the following verse too, the poet gives us an equally charming and interesting *Anyokti*. The idea that he wants to convey is that when a person is seen to be promising, many come forward to claim him for themselves. It is this clamour for owning him that presents the most disgusting sight. This

idea is put by the poet in the form of the *Anyokti*. A young one of a cuckoo is, as soon as it tries to win the hearts of others by its sweet notes, claimed as its off-spring by a crow which makes a sudden appearance in a pleasure-grove where the audience which had begun to enjoy the sweet notes of the cuckoo, feels perturbed and disappointed. The verse which presents this *Anyokti* runs thus :-

*vācā komalayā sukokilaśiṣuḥ kalyāṇakalpām kathām
sarvāvarjanam ārjavena kurute yāvat puro rāgiṇām ।
tāvan mattanayo 'yam ity avirataṁ drāṅkārabhūmaravair
dhvāṅkṣeṇopavane nipatya nabhasaḥ sarve kṛtā mīrasāhīḥ*

“As soon as the young one of a cuckoo with its tender notes makes in all its innocence a blissful utterance captivating one and all in the presence of music-loving, anxious audience, there appears from the sky quite suddenly a crow which with its ceaseless harsh cries claims it to be its own off-spring. At this every body present in the garden feels upset and sad.”

Another verse where a cuckoo is used as the medium of the *Anyokti* is as follows :

*śrotrotsavam tava kalam kalakaṇṭha ko'tra
nādam śṛṇoti iti vighrahasandhidūtam ।
kākair ulūkakalahair iha gulmakeṣu
kreṅkāraghargararavaiḥ śrutir āgatāstam ।᳚*

“O sweet-throated cuckoo ! who is there to listen to your sweet notes, the feast to the ears, the harbinger of peace in love quarrels? Here in these shrubs the ears have become defended by the fights among crows and owls.”

The idea in the above example is that the din and turmoil that is raised by the petty people is responsible many a time for turning the people's minds away from the finer things of life. The author of the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa has been able to give expression to this idea most effectively. It could not have been better expressed.

Of the *Anyoktis* where a crow is employed as the medium for propounding some truth, mention may here be made of the two which are found in the canto one hundred and sixteenth of the second half of the sixth book which has preserved for us a few of the finest *Anyoktis* of the Sanskrit literature. One such

today that apprehensiveness of yours that you are bringing up uselessly this young one of a cuckoo in the hope of obtaining only one off-spring, which Nature has vouchsafed to you, you being *ekaputra* or *sakṛtpraja*. This makes a fit object for ridicule.

Of the *Anyoktis* having a cloud as the medium, mention may be made here of the two which are so interesting and remarkable that they can stand comparison with some of the very best of their kind in the whole of the Sanskrit literature. One of them is:

*śrīmadvṛtta mahāśayātapahara proccair gabhīrākṛte bhūbhṛ-
nmūrdhasu bhūṣaṇaṁ bhavasi bho bhūme rasaikāspadam ।
etat tu kṣapayen manāṁsi yad idaṁ megha tvayā varṣatā
harṣād ūṣarapalvalasthalataruṣv ambhovichhāgakraṁaḥ ॥ 7*

"O cloud! you are in an ornament on the heads of the mountains. You are source of the water on the earth. You have a brilliant conduct. You are magnanimous. You remove the heat. Your appearance is very solemn. But (inspite of all these qualitie) this will cause pain to the minds of the people when in your joy you send showers, you divide you waters equally between fallow lands, ponds, land trees."

In other words in the grab of a cloud a person is reproached here who, while giving does not make distinction between the deserving and the undeserving. If a person like a cloud which pours it waters at a place where they are not wanted and go waste, gives liberally without giving due thought to the qualities and the requirements of the person who receives the gift, cannot earn a good name. His charity may be misused by the unscrupulous and in that case the donor cannot escape the blame, however, well-meaning he may be. While doing a good turn pick-and-choose is what is really necessary. When there is such pick-and-choose then the good work done by the donor will earn him the appreciation of all and the possibility of a good thing leading to evil results would also be obviated. The second is:

*nityaṁ snāsi sulīrthavārivisarair uccaiḥ padastho 'mbuda
śuddhaḥ san vipināvanau nivasasi prārabdhamānavrataḥ ।
riktasyā py atikāntir eva bhavataḥ kāyāśrayā lakṣyate
pranahyāśanīm ātanosi kim idaṁ tucchaṁ tavāceṣṭitam ॥ 8*

“O cloud! you always take bath in the expansive waters of the holy places sitting high up. Thus purified, you undertake a vow of silence and live forest lands. Even when you are emptied of your contents, your body appears very lustrous. (But) what is this mean act of yours that you get up and produce (smashing) lightening and thunder (thundering noise)?”

In above verse in the garb of the cloud some-body is reproached for inconsistency in, and impropriety of conduct and that is what makes it an *Anyokti*. A person may be virtuous, pure, self-restrained and generous. His conduct should consist of these virtues. When generous, he should be sweet as well. He should not preface his act of making gifts with harsh words for the recipients. These will humiliate them and will take the grace out of his charity. As a matter of fact, the works on social ethics points out that while giving something in a charity one should not be actuated even by an element of pity for the supplicant. Even that is considered undesirable, but if, in addition to this, one were to use harsh words, that would certainly be uncharitable.

Another verse which employs a crow for an *Anyokti* is as follows :

*ālokya pañkajavane savilāsavantam
kākam kalāṅkasadṛśam bhṛśam āraṭantam ।
hā kaṣṭhaśabdaśatanaṣṭaviceṣṭito yo
no roditi krakacakena vidāryatām saḥ ॥ 9*

“Seeing a crow looking like a dark spot, sporting in a lotus-bed and continuously crying, a person who, though rendered inactive by hundreds of the jarring notes does not weep, let him be torn asunder by a saw.”

The implication of the *Anyokti* in above verse is that the sight of a mean and ignoble person occupying a place, which in the fitness of things belongs to the noble, and acting disgustfully should sadden and distress any sensible person. A person who remains unmoved, deserves all contempt and condemnation.

There are a few beautiful and charming *Anyoktis* of *Ākāśa* or the sky in the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*. In one of these the sky, though possessing all good qualities is said to have one

bad thing about it, which is, that it sheds burning heat. The idea is that a person should be good-natured, amiable and sweet apart from his being possessed of many other qualities and merits. But if he is not amiable and flies into rage, thereby creating unnecessary heat, all his other qualities will be of no avail. The absence of this one quality is enough to lower him in public estimation. This interesting *Anyokti* is found in the following verse:

*kalpābhradrumavīrudunnatidṛśāṁ kartāsi dhartāsi ca
ākāśendughanārkaṁkinnaramarutskandhāmarāṇām api ।
sarvaṁ ramyaṁ asaṅkulāśaya samasvacchasvabhāvasya te yat
tv etad dahanatvam aṅga tad aho mukhyāya khedāya naḥ ॥¹⁰*

“O sky! you lead to the growth of trees, creepers and bring forth clouds at the time of universal destruction and you sustain the moon, the sun, the *Kinnaras*, the *Marut-Skandhas* and the gods. O magnanimous one, of you who have even and clean nature everything else is charming, but that you shed burning heat is the cause of our great torment.”

We have another equally beautiful *Anyokti* of the sky. The sky and through that medium some other thing also is the object of censure here. The sky merits censure, for it allows a cloud to rest on it and sends down a shower of hail for pounding people below, implying that, however, high and noble a person may be he should not allow others, who may use his patronage for oppressing the people, to surround him. They will bring him a bad name. These underlings very often prove the greatest drags on the reputation and the prestige of the high placed persons who may have personally nothing reproachable about them. It is not an uncommon sight in this world to see the petty officials of the village and district levels working under the protective shadows of their superiors or the provincial government bringing disrepute to the entire administrative machinery by their oppressive acts and third-degree methods. That these small fry are allowed protection by the superiors proves the greatest weakness of them. Such a beautiful all-time truth is enunciated by the author of the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* in the following verse :

ākāśa kāśam asi nirmālam accham uccair-

*ādhāra unnatayatottamam uttamānām
tvām etya kin tu viralam karakāghano 'yam
lokam vimardayati tena paro 'si nīcāiḥ ॥ ११ ॥*

“O sky ! you are shining, pure and clean. On account of your loftiness you are the substratum of the best. But you are the meanest of all too, because considering that you have a space, a hail-showering cloud resorts to you and pounds the people (by a shower of hail).

Yet another similarly interesting *Anyokti* is found in the verse :

*ākāśa karṣakaṣa eva nikarṣaṇam te
manyē ciraṁ samucitaṁ na tu kiñcid anyat ।
śūnyo 'si yaj jaladhararkṣavimānacandra
sūryānilān vahasi bhāsi na cārthaśūnyaḥ ॥ १२ ॥*

“O sky! I think, what is proper for you is that you should be rubbed for quite sometime on the touch-stone and nothing else, for even though a void you carry on you the clouds, the stars, the aerial cars, the moon, the sun and the air and thus appear not to be a void.”

The poet means to say that the nature of things and persons is sometimes difficult to ascertain. Particularly the nature of the great is inscrutable. It is undefinable, for it is tintured by inconsistencies, by the opposites which go ill together. Apparently stern, a great person may be really gentle; apparently callous, he may be full of the milk of human kindness; apparently short-sighted, he may be really far-sighted, seeing things beyond the ken of ordinary mortals. Surely his nature is a complex which defies analysis and baffles comprehension. Truly has the poet Bhavabhūti observed :

*vajrād api kṣhorāṇi mṛdūni kusumād api ।
lokottarāṇāṁ cetāṁsi ko nu vijñātum arhati ॥ १३ ॥*

“Who can understand the heart of the great people which is at once harder than a thunderbolt and softer than a flower?”

It is in this context that the authors of the Dharmasūtras declare : *na devacaritaṁ caret.*

After this we have in the Vāsiṣṭha *Rāmāyaṇa* an interesting *Anyokti* where the sky is said to assume a number

of forms and by so doing suggests a clever person whose ways are rather unpredictable. Even the wise will not be able to predict his movements. His mind will run in devious ways. He will adopt different postures in different places. What his real self is nobody will ever be able to find out. His character and conduct will always remain an enigma, however, closely and minutely he may be watched. This fundamental truth is expressed in the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa in the following verse :

*ahni prakāśam asi raktavapur dinānte
yāmāsu kṣṇam atha cākḥilavasturiktam ।
nityam na kiñcid api sad vahasīti māyām
na vyoma veti viduṣo 'pi viceṣṭitam te ॥¹⁴*

“You are resplendent by day, assume a red form in the evening, are dark and empty, (as it were) of all things at night. Although you are ever nothing, you always carry (the stars, the moon etc.) on you. O sky, even though you are wise nobody knows your clever movements.”

Apart from the *Anyoktis* cited above there are many others which are no less interesting and charming. As a matter of fact, nearly the whole of the one hundred and sixteenth canto of the sixth book is replete with verses which approximate in character to the *Anyokti*. This very well helps bring out the author's love for *Anyoktis* in which he is seen to be in his top-form. The language and the style of the *Anyokti* verses is simply excellent and is a pattern for the later age when poets like Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha enriched the Sanskrit literature with their *Anyoktis* some of which have passed into common use.

References

1. vi (ii), 116.77.
2. vi (ii), 215.80.
3. vi (vi). 116.76
4. vi (ii) 116.75
5. vi. (ii). 116.63.
6. vi (ii). 116.70
7. 2. vi. (ii) 116.50.
8. vi (ii). 186.51.
9. V (ii) 116.71
10. VI (ii) 116.114.

11. VI. (ii) 116.15.
12. VI (ii) 116.16
13. *Uttararāmacaritam*, II.7.
14. VI (ii) 116.17:

Conception of Time in Post-Vedic Sanskrit Literature

It is very difficult to say anything definitely about abstract things. Time is one such thing. In the West, philosopher after philosopher and the physicist after physicist has worked on it to know it, yet it seems to be far too elusive.

According to Bergson time is made to a stuff which is called reality. Time is reality itself.

According to Alexander it is the soul of space and space-time is the soul of all reality.

As for Einstein's conception of time we may quote the words of Wildon Carr: "The principle of relativity declares that there is no absolute magnitude, that there exists whatever which can claim to be great or small in its own nature, also there is no absolute duration, nothing whatever which in its own nature is short or long. I co-ordinate my universe from my own standpoint of rest in a system of reference in relation to which all else is moving....Space and Time are not containers nor are they contents but variants!."

Such is the line along which the philosophy of time has been developed in the West. Philosopher after philosopher there has studied the concepts of Time and Space. Kant, Alexander, Bergson, Whitehead, Bradley, Taylor, Spinoza—all have tried to analyse the time-concept in their own way. So much of energy has been expended on it and so much of thinking has gone in for its clear exposition that is difficult to present it in a short compass. We, therefore, desist from it and devote ourselves to the exposition of the Time Philosophy in the religious and secular literature of Sanskrit only which is presented in the following pages.

The Smṛtis

Of all the Smṛtis only the *Manusmṛti* gives us some idea of time and its various divisions. It reads :

*kālaṁ kālavibhaktiś ca
nakṣatrāṇi grahāṁs tathā.²*

The singular in *kālaṁ* in the verse implies time as a principle while plural in *kālavibhaktis* implies the empirical divisions of it.

It is interesting to note here that the above passage has been interpreted differently by different commentators. Medhātithi, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda and Nandana accept the aggregate of the motions of the sun, stars etc. as time. They, therefore, seem to accept the view of the astronomers on time *sa eva grahatārādiparispanḍaḥ kāla ity ucyate*³. Sarvajña Nārāyaṇa, however, differs from this view. He accepts time as *Puruṣa* (Spirit) who is sentient. The word *kālavibhaktiḥ* in the verse in the *Manusmṛti* refers, according to him, to the presiding deities (*abhimānidevatāḥ*) of moments, days, months, years, and epochs. The commentator Rāmacandra differs from both of these views. He accepts time as *Samvatsara* and the divisions of time as the six seasons;

*pūrvam kālaṁ kālātmakasaṁvatsararūpaṁ Kālaṁ
asṛjat Kālasya vibhāgāṁś ca śaḍṛtū ayanādīṁś ca.*

This is clearly the view of the Ṛgveda too. We see there as to how the commentators expound one and the same passage in the *Manusmṛti* according to their own set views and notions.

The Purāṇas

From *Manusmṛti* we pass on to the Purāṇas. These offer quite a variety of views on Time. Taking the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* first of all, we find that Brahman is described there as existing in the form of *Vyakta*, *Āvyakta*, *Puruṣa* and *Kāla*.

*tad eva sarvaṁ evaitad vyaktāvyaktasvarūpavat ।
tathā puruṣarūpeṇa kālārūpeṇa ca sthītam ॥⁴*

“All this, whether manifest or unmanifest, is nothing, but that (Intelligence), it appears as *Puruṣa* and as *Kāla*.”

Śrīdhara explains the above passage as:

vyaktam mahadādi, avyaktam pradhānam.

The Viṣṇu Purāṇa further declares—

kālasvarūpaṁ rūpaṁ tad Viṣṇor Maitreya vartate 1⁹

“O Maitreya! Viṣṇu is of the form of Kāla.” Here the passage explicitly says that Viṣṇu is *Kāla*.

The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* accepts time to be eternal. It existed even before creation came into being, and it will exist even after it is dissolved. As a matter of fact, all this creation and dissolution, etc. do not exist at all. It says:

anādir bhagvān kālo nānto 'śya dvija vidyate 1

avyucchinās tatas tv ete sṛṣṭisthityantasamyamāḥ 1⁶

“O Brāhmaṇa, the all-powerful *Kāla* is eternal (beginnings) and endless; hence creation, stasis and dissolution are all ever-recurrent.’ It is because *Kāla* is equated here with Viṣṇu that He is spoken of as *Ānādi* and *Ananta*. The idea of continuous flow that the passage above conveys, makes it also the basis of the theory of momentariness (*kṣaṇikavāda*) which we find so elaborated in the *Yoga Sūtra* and its *Bhāṣya* where it is said that a moment (*kṣaṇa*) is the ultimate minimum of time and cannot be further divided up...and the continuous flow of such moments is their ‘course’ (*krama*)...their uninterrupted course is what is called ‘time’.⁸

Now we come to the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. In the beginning, this *Purāṇa* describes the process of creation.⁹ A special power of *śakti* of the Lord, *Kāla* by name, remains in a dormant and latent state at the time of Dissolution. The *śakti* named *Kāla* impelled by God awakens when the new creation is contemplated. This very idea is conveyed by the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* in the following words :

sontaḥ śarire 'rptabhūtasūtasūkṣmaḥ Kālātmikāṁ 'śaktim
udīrayānaḥ 1
uvāsa tasmin salile pade sve yathānalo dāruṇi ruddhavīryaḥ 11¹⁰

“He (Viṣṇu), withdrawing all beings into (making all beings recede into) his (all encompassing) Body, and bringing into play his *śakti* known as *Kāla* dwelt in his home of water, like fire latent in wood.”

Śrīdharasvāin, the commentator, very correctly interprets *Kālātmikāṃ śaktim udīrayāṇaḥ* in the verse quoted above as *kālaśakteh preraṇaṃ punaḥ sṛṣṭyavasare prabodhanārtham* or 'to bring into play (to impel) *Kālaśakti* means to awaken it again at the beginning of the creation. Those who subscribe to the views of Madhava, however, interpret *udīrayāṇaḥ* in the sense of creating and thereby conclude that time according to the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* is created by God and is hence *anitya*, not eternal. This view does not, however, appeal to reason, for it is doubtful if *vir* ever means 'to create'. Be that as it may, there can be no doubt, at least on this point, that *Kālaśakti* associated with Lord Viṣṇu whether it is identical with him or is created by Him, we are not concerned with it at present. The associates of *Kālaśakti* is very clearly brought out in the following verse of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*:

*viśvaṃ vai Brahma tanmātraṃ saṁsthitaṃ Viṣṇumāyayā ।
Īśvareṇa paricchinnaṃ Kālenāvyaktamūrtinā*||¹²

"The universe is verily *Brahma-tanmātra*, in essence Brahman, and is withdrawn by the *māyā* of Viṣṇu. It is put forward as something distinct by the Lord with the help of the formless *Kāla*."

The epithet *avyaktamūrti* in the verse above purports to mean that the Lord is by Himself unqualified. This is how the commentator Śrīdharasvāmin construes his verse. In our opinion the Lord is here identified with *Kāla*. *Kālena* is in apposition with *Īśvareṇa* and not the instrumental case signifying *nimitta*. The epithet *avyaktamūrtinā* is also construction with *Kālena* and not with the intercepted *Īśvareṇa*.

The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* accepts two kinds of time, gross and subtle, both knowable by inference only. It is time that determines all the actions that are termed manifest, *vyakta*. It reads:

*evam kālo 'py anumitah saukṣmye sthaule ca sattama ।
saṁsthānabhuktyā bhagavān avyakto vyaktabhug vibhuh*||¹³

"Thus time is inferred to be both gross and subtle. O best of men, the Lord, by reason of His pervasion of *paramāṇus*, though Himself unmanifest, enjoys (pervades determines) the

manifest."

Samsthāna in the verse, says the commentator, is in forms such as *paramāṇu* and *bhukti* is its pervasion.

Bhagavān means the *śakti* (for there is the identity of *śakti* and the possessor of *śakti*). This very idea is elaborated in the next verse

*sa kālaḥ paramāṇur vai yo bhuñkte paramānutām ।
savato' viśeṣabhug yas tu sa kālaḥ paramo mahān ॥⁴*

which says that much is termed the *Paramāṇukāla* which enjoys atomicity (*paramāṇutā*), by nature pervades everything, he is the great *Kāla*. On this the commentator Śrīdharasvāmin says:

*graharkṣatārācakrastha (bhagavata 3.11.4) ityādinā
yat sūryaparyāṭanam vakṣyate tatra sūryo yāvata
paramāṇudeśam atikrāmati tāvān kālaḥ paramāṇuḥ,
yāvata paramāṇudeśam atikrāmati tāvān kālaḥ
paramāṇuḥ, yāvata ca dvādaśarāśyātmakam
bhuvanakoṣam atikrāmati sa paramamahān samvatsa-
rātmakah kālaḥ, tasyaivāvṛttyā yugamanvantarā-
dikrameṇa dviparārdhamattvam iti. tathā ca pañcame
(Adhyāya 21.) sūryagatyava kālādivibhāgam vakṣyati.*

"The verse *graharkṣatārācakrastha* (Bhāgavata, 3.11.13.) speaks of the motion of the sun. That much is termed the *Paramāṇukāla*, which the sun takes to traverse an atom, and that which it takes to traverse all the twelve signs (the zodiac) in the year. By its rotation we have a development beginning with *yuga* (cycle), *manvantara* (period) and ending with *parārdha*. Accordingly the author does well to treat of the division of time as effected by the motion of the Sun."

The long and short of the whole discussion is that along with the *Kālaśakti* there is also recognised the empirical time which form the *Kālaśakti* assumes on account of the limiting condition, the motion of the Sun.

Of all the Purāṇas (with the full knowledge of the limitation of our study) we can say that it is only the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata which present time-concept with a philosophical and somewhat mystical tint. In other Purāṇas *Kāla* is explicitly recognized as a Deity, all-powerful, and all-pervasive. It is

described there as follows:

*anādir eṣa bhagavān kalo 'nanto 'jaraḥ paraḥ ।
sārvagatvāt svatantratvāt sarvātmavān maheśvaraḥ ॥*

*Brahmāṇo bahavo Rudrā anye Nārāyaṇādayaḥ ।
eko hi bhagavān īśaḥ kālāḥ kavir iti smṛtaḥ ॥*

*Brahmanārāyaṇeśānām trayāṇām prakaroti yaḥ ।
procyate kālayogena punar eva ca sambhavaḥ ॥*

*kālenaiva hi sṛjyante se eva grasate punaḥ ।
tasmāt kālātmakam viśvaṁ sa eva parameśvaraḥ ॥¹⁵*

*anādinidhanah kālo Rudraḥ Saṅkarṣaṇaḥ smṛtaḥ ।
karṣaṇāt sarvabhūtānām sa tu Saṅkarṣaṇaḥ smṛtaḥ ॥*

*sarvabhūtaśamitvāc ca sa Rudraḥ parikūṛtitaḥ ।
anādinidhanatvena sa mahān parameśvaraḥ ॥¹⁶*

“The great is Lord beginningless and endless (*anādiḥanantaḥ*). He is said to have created even gods like Vāsudeva, Svyambhū and Śaṅkara. There are many gods like many Rudras and Nārāyaṇa etc. Of all these he is the great Lord. He is the great Lord as he is all-pervasive, independent and the soul of all.”

It is this conception of *Kāla* as a Deity, all-powerful and all-pervasive, that seems to find an echo in the work of the great grammarian Bhartṛhari when he, while mentioning the three different views on Time, picks up the concept of Time as a Deity as one among them. Says he—*Śaktyātmadeatāpakair bhinnam kālasya darśanam*.¹⁷ About its *Devatāpakṣa* Helārāja's comment is significant ; *kecit tu mahāprabhāvām devatām Kālatvenābhyupapannāḥ*, which means that some regard time to be an all-powerful Deity.

Agama Literature

Now, from the Purāṇas, we pass on to the Āgamas. There are different Āgamas from which we have traced here a lot of references to time. We shall take up these Āgamas one by one and deal with them briefly.

Pratyabhijñādarśana

A school of Kāśmīra Śaivism, the Pratyabhijñādarśana recognizes *kāla*. We read :

*sarvakaraḥ sarvajñāḥ pūrṇo nityo 'saṅkucanīś ca ।
viparīta iva maheśo yābhis tā bhavanti pañca saktrayaḥ ॥*¹⁸

Out of the five *śaktis* referred to here, one is which the Parimala, the commentary, explains as *bhāvānām avabhāsanānavabhāsanātmā kramah*.

According to this Darśana, the five *śaktis* are in no way different from *Īśvarecchā* or the will of God and this again is not different from *kriyā*. About *kāla* it is said that it has no existence outside the cognizer (experient). It comes to be related to the objects of cognition through the cognizer. This is what Ācārya Abhinavagupta says in the following words :

*Kālaḥ kramam āsūtrayan pramātari vijṛmbhamāṇaḥ
tadanusāreṇa prameye' pi prasarati ॥*¹⁹

Mṛgendrāgama

According to the *Mṛgendrāgama*, *kāla* is perishable, non-pervasive and manifold. It is non-sentient. The view of the Naiyāyikas that *kāla* is not *kriyā* is acceptable to this school. The nature of *kāla* is discussed in a beautiful passage in the *Mṛgendrāgamavṛttidīpikā* which bears reproduction :

*astu tarhi Naiyāyikādyabhupagata evātra kriyāvya-
tiriktaḥ kālaḥ. satyam. na tu nityo vyāpako vā. tasya
vividhatvenānekatvāt acetanatvāc ca . ekarūpative hi
kālasya sarvadā padārthānām ekakālatā syāt, drśyante
ca kecid varta mātāḥ kecid atītāḥ bhāvinaś ca kecid
bhāvāḥ. tataḥ kālasyanekatvaṁ. kāla eva triprakāraḥ*²⁰

“Let us accept the view of the Naiyāyikas that *kāla* is something other than *kriyā* (action). But that cannot be eternal and ubiquitous, it being diverse and composite (manifold) and non-sentient. If the time be a uniform entity, all things would be contemporaneous. But things are perceived to be either present or past or future. It, therefore, follows that *kāla* is manifold. Time is of three kinds.”

Śaktas

The Śāktas believe that this world is a product of reflection of *Citi* and is, therefore, unreal. They say :

...ekarūpāpi citiḥ svātantrya hetuḥ ।
 svāntar vibhāsayed bāhyam ādarśe gaganam yathā ॥
 nāsti cetyam ceter anyat
 darpaṇe pratibimbavat १¹

Kāla is also an assumption, it has no existence in fact. The assumed *kāla* too is free from such variations as subtlety (*sūkṣmatva*) and elongation (*dirghatva*) it is only our thinking that differentiates one and the same thing. This is declared in so many words in the *Tripurārahasya* :

deśaḥ kālo 'thavā kiñcid yathā, nena vibhāvitam ।
 tathā tat tatra bhāseta dīrghasūkṣmatvabhedataḥ ॥²²

Nakulīśapāśupatas

The *Nakulīśapāśupata* school, otherwise known as *Pañcārthaśāstra* on account of the five categories in which it believes, does not seem to accept *kāla* as an independent entity. The five *Padārthas* that the followers of the school enumerate do not include *kāla*. Nor is *kāla* acceptable to another branch of this school which accepts only three *Padārthas*, *Tattva*, *Guṇa*, and *Bhava*. The first branch of the *Nakulīśapāśupata* school believes that *Īśvara*, the one cause of all, is *Kāla*, the Destroyer.

Dvaitaśāktas

The *Dvaita-śaktas* postulate four categories. They are named in the *Pārānandasūtra* as: *anādyanantasādyanantā-nādisāntasādisāntāḥ*.²³ To them *Kāla* is beginningless and endless and is all pervasive. Itself limited in the form of *kṣaṇa* (moment). *nimeṣa* (wink) it limits objects such as a jar.

Kālaḥ paricchedakaḥ pariechinnaś ca.²⁴

Prapañcasāra

According to the *Prapañcasāra*, attributed to *Śaṅkarācārya*, three external Existences are admitted—matter, soul and time. The commentator *Padmapādācārya* explains:

evam parakālasyāpi svarūpam abhidhāyāparam kalam
 prastauti-laveti.

Each one of these is twofold, being differentiated as *para* and *apara*. The *Prayogakramadīpikā*, however, explains that *Kāla* is unreal. It says,

*devatātattvaṃ cidrūpam ekam eva, tasya svaśakti-
kalpita evāyaṃ prakṛtipuruṣakā-lātmakavikalpaḥ*²⁵

and adds:

*atra ca prakṛtivyāyasarvajñā napreraṇālakṣaṇa
idrūpaṃkālasya svarūpam ityapi pratipāditam*²⁶

giving us a definition of time, stating precisely the nature of its function.

The view of the *Prapañcasāra* briefly is: The Absolute Reality viewed as *Prakṛti* is Pure Consciousness and is the origin of all things. It remains always what it is and yet when the latent *karmas* of *jīvas* are matured for fructification it becomes, in a part as it were, alienated from itself, externalized and relatively dense. This part is called *Prakṛtītattva*. When *kāla* acts on the lower *Prakṛti*, the latter is split up into three forms, viz. *Bindu*, *Nāda* and *Bīja*. The cleavage of *Prakṛti* under the influence of Time is the occasion for the origin of what for lack of more appropriate, term is called sound (*Śabda*) which is equivalent to what philosophers describe as *Āvyakta* or *Śabda Brahman*. It is evident from the above that in this view *kāla* functions as the matuer of *karma*—seeds (*karma-pācaka*) and then as the energiser of *Prakṛti*.

Trika Literature

In the *Trika* Literature *Kāla*, viewed in the Absolute *Parama Śiva*, represents His Supreme Freedom (*Svātantryaśakti*) looked upon as *kriyāśakti* projecting the Universe till now unified with the Absolute and making it appear as external to it. The projection of the Universe is, therefore, only the apparent externalization of the Eternal Consciousness. The so-called creative process (*Viśvakalanā*) is only the outer aspect of the *kriyāśakti*, which inspite of its seeming eternality retains itself always. The truth is that the Absolute Consciousness first appears as Life or *Prāṇa* (i.e. *Kriyāśakti*), on which as a base is built up the entire fabric of Time and Space.

Time in Secular Literature

In all these pages we have been dealing with the concept of time in the *Smṛtis* and the *Purāṇas*. Now we propose to deal

with it in the secular literature. When we study it, we find in it sometimes striking references to time in its philosophical aspect. The older texts like the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Caraka Saṁhitā* very often present to us various views on time in a philosophical garb and, therefore, indicate that phase of the development of the secular literature when the word *kāla* had not become restricted to the meaning of 'death' or the 'god of death,' the meaning which it developed in later *kāvya* literature. Under this heading of 'Time in Secular Literature' we propose to deal with six authors and commentators—Patañjali, Caraka, Ḍaḥaṇa, Vātsyāyana, Yaśodhara (commentator on the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana) and Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Vākyapadīya*. We include the popular view and the views of the *Yogavāsīṣṭha* and the astronomers too under this very heading.

Patañjali

Patañjali has not attributed eternity to the Vedas and *Śabda* (Sphoṭa) alone but has also included, the sky, heaven, space and time in the same category. According to the Naiyāyikas, the earth, light, water and air are external in so far as their ultimate atoms are concerned while the sky, time, mind, the quarters and the soul are regarded to be permanent in their entirety. Under the rule *nitye hi kālanakṣatre*²⁷ Patañjali has expressly stated that both time and stars are permanent. He arrives at the final stage of his arguments that a thing wherein the ultimate essence is not destroyed is also to be considered to be permanent ;

*tad api nityam yasmims tattvam na vihanyate.*²⁸

Time is said to be the ultimate substratum of the world: *Kālo hi jagadādhāraḥ*. It is indivisible, permanent, one, and permeating the whole world. We can neither trace its origin, nor divide it into parts. Things grow and perish in time. Patañjali defines time as that whereby the growth and decay of material objects are perceived :

*yena mūrṣinām upacayaś cāpacayaś ca lakṣyante tam
kālam āhuḥ tasyaiva kayācit kriyayā yuktasyāhar iti
bhavati ratrir iti cal.*²⁹

The division of time into day and night, months, years, cycles etc. is only an artificial process of calculation; it is by virtue of its conjunction with some action as the movement of the Sun: *kayā kriyayā ? ādityagatyā*³⁰ that we say it is day, it is night. In other words the movement of the Sun is the basis of our conception of the so-called divisions of time.

Patañjali also discusses whether there is present time or not. In this connection he says —

*anāgatam atikrāntam vartamānam iti trayam ।
sarvatra ca gatir nāsti gacchālīti kim ucyate ॥*³¹

He then discusses the pros and cons of the views of the non-existence of the present time and ultimately proves that the present time does exist. Altogether he quotes six beautiful verses which he frankly admits are taken from other works.

Caraka

Caraka Saṁhitā, even though it shows special favour for Sāṁkhya views at the other places, enumerates in *Sūtrasthāna*, (towards the beginning of the *Saṁhitā*) nine substances,

*khādiny ātmā manaḥ kālo dīśaś ca dravyasaṁgrahaḥ*³²

which are accepted by the Vaiśeṣikas. The nine substances are—earth, water, fire, air, sky, time, space (*dik*), soul and mind. These nine substances of the Vaiśeṣikas include *Kāla* and, as Caraka accepts these very nine substances, he shows that time is according to him, a substance. Further, Caraka divides substances into sentient (*cetana*) and non-sentient (*acetana*),

*sendriyam cetapam dravyam nirindriyam acetanam*³³

of which the Soul only is sentient on account of its association with the sense-organs while all the rest of the substances including *Kāla*, are non-sentient.

While enumerating the nine substances Caraka says,

Kālo dīśaś ca dravyasaṁgrahaḥ.³⁴

Caraka accepts *Kāla* as one. It seems, therefore, that so far as the concept of time is concerned Caraka subscribes to the Vaiśeṣika view.

Ḍalhaṇa

Ācārya Ḍalhaṇa, the commentator of the *Suśruta Saṁhitā*, seems to subscribe to the view of the Sāṁkhya. To him, as to the teachers of Sāṁkhya, *Kāla* is a modification of *rajoguṇa* and is not different from *Prakṛti* itself. Quotes Ḍalhaṇa

mahābhūtaviśeṣāṁs tu śītoṣṇadvayabhedaṭaḥ ।

Kāla ity adhyavasyanti Nyāyamārgānusāriṇaḥ ॥

*Kriyātvena rajouṇapariṇāmātvaṇ mahābhūtapariṇāmaviśeṣatvāc ca na kālasya prakṛter anyatvam*³⁵

Vātsyāyana and Yaśodhara

In the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, there is no reference to the nature of *Kāla*. Only this much is said that *Kāla* is the cause of good or bad, victory or defeat, happiness or sorrow

kāla eva hi puruṣān arthānarthayor jayaparāja yayoh

*sukhaduḥkhaḥ ca sthāpayati.*³⁶

But in the commentary of Jayamaṅgalā by Yaśodhara, time is said to be eternal and is called a substance

*kālo nāma dravyapadārtho nityaḥ*³⁷

This view also seems to conform to the Vaiśeṣika standpoint.

Astronomers

The astronomers believe that *Kāla* is nothing but the movement of the planets, stars, etc. Jayantabhaṭṭa says in *Nyāyamañjarī* :

*na Devadattādiparispandanibandhanāḥ kṛmākramā dipratyayāḥ, kintu grahanakṣatrādiparispandanibandhanāḥ ; sa eva grahatārādiparispandāḥ kāla ity ucyate । tatkr̥ta evāyaṁ yāmāhorātramāsādivyavahārah ।... Kālavidaś ca jyotirgaṇakās ta evainaṁ budhyante ।*³⁸

The same idea is expressed in *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā* in words:

*jyotiḥśāstradr̥ṣṭyā kriyāviśeṣātmaka evābhyupagamyate.*³⁹

In Astronomy it (*kāla*) is accepted as a special movement (of the stars, planets, etc). Then the *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā* (10.15.)

gives the following verse.

*ādityagrahatārādīparispandam athāpare i'
bhinnam āvṛttibhedena kālaṁ kālavido viduḥ ॥⁴⁰*

“Other knowers of time know *kāla* to be the movement of the Sun, the planets and the stars as differentiated by revolutions.”

Yogavāsiṣṭha

In the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is given a detailed description of the emergence of the Creation. There it is said that ‘immediately after the creation of *Jiva*, the *Kha* (sky, ether) emerges which is almost a void, the germ of properties such as sound, and which gives significance to future names. Later *Āhaṁkāra* follows along with Time :

*samānāntaram evāsyāḥ khasattodeti 'sūnyatā ।
śabdādiguṇabhījaṁ sā bhaviṣyad-abhidhārthadā ॥
ahantodeti tadan u saha vai kālasattayā. १¹*

The *Vāsiṣṭhatātāparyaprakāśa* explains the text thus :

Now, with a view to discussing the creation of Mahābhūtas the writer begins with the creation of Kha. Immediately after the creation of Jiva, the Kha comes into being, itself almost a void, being the substratum of the remaining four elements. After the creation of the Sun etc., it gives significance to future names such as Ākāśa which literally means 'what shines all round'.... This creation of Ākāśa, Āhaṁkāra and Kāla is not from Hiranyagarbha but from the Supreme Being limited by its particular forms.⁴²

In the *Śukropākhyāna* of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* while Bhṛgu is about to pronounce a curse on *Kāla* who has taken away the life of his son. *Kāla* appears in human form and says: “Your curse would make no difference to me. For I am the manager of destiny (*vayaṁ niyatipālakāḥ*). Your curse would fail to burn me, for I am the eater and you are the food. I have consumed rows of universe, swallowed crores of *Rudras*.⁴³

The description of *kāla* as it is given in the *Śukropākhyāna* is interesting from two points of view. Firstly, *kāla* is here an allegorical description of the empirical time divided into months

and seasons. Secondly, it recognizes the all-powerful character of *kāla*. In other words it believes *kāla* to be a Supreme Force as it is recognized by many other schools of Indian philosophy.

The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is remarkable in that it sets forth views that agree strikingly with the latest theories on time and space. Time and space are relative to the observer. This is the Theory of Relativity of Einstein about time and space, which has revolutionised all the thinking about time and space. A day may appear much shorter to a man who is gay and cheerful, while it may appear much longer to one who is pensive and tired. The same can be said about distance. A man high in spirits will not mind walking a distance of ten miles in a hill station where he has gone for enjoyment and fun, while the same distance may appear never-ending to a hilly labourer who toils hard the whole day, wearied and broken and leaves for his home in the evening. According to this view, all the motion that appears in the Creation is due to the conscious passage of time in an observer. This fact leads us to the well-known *dr̥ṣṭisṛṣṭi-vāda*, the theory that there is no creation without an observer.

The theory that time and space are relative to the observer is propounded in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* at a number of places. It is said that time and space are thoughts. It is upon thoughts that their existence depends.

Just as the appearance of the world is a thought-appearance, so also is the appearance of the moments and ages.⁴⁴ A moment is doubtless experienced as a *Kalpa*, when consciousness of *Kalpa* is experienced in it; similarly a *Kalpa* is experienced as a moment if the consciousness of a moment is present in it.⁴⁵ The same period of a night is experienced as a *Kalpa* by the miserable, and a moment by the happy. In dream a moment is experienced as a *Kalpa* and a *Kalpa* is passed as a moment. Time-Space order is dependent on the mind. The mind can experience a moment as a *Kalpa* and vice-versa within itself.⁴⁶ What is a life-time to Manu is an hour to Brahmā, what is a life-time to Viṣṇu is a day to Śiva. He, whose mind is lost in meditation, experiences neither day nor night.⁴⁷ A day passes as a year for those who are separated from their beloveds.⁴⁸

The whole world-process occurs within a millionth part of a moment of the consciousness of the Self. ⁴⁹ The extent of the same world-process may be a moment for some and a long age for others. As a person experiencing a dream has the experience of stability, so has the person experiencing the world process.

According to Svāmī Mādhavātīrtha⁵⁰ the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is the only philosophical work in India in which the concept of time is made sufficiently clear. This agrees remarkably with the latest discoveries of the modern science. The Svāmī quotes three stories from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and proves that these indicate the relative concept which is accepted to be the latest theory on time.

Time in Popular View

Kāla in popular view has nothing to do with its philosophical abstruseness. As in old days so now the common man uses the word in the sense of time and fate. The senses of time and fate given to *Kāla* include the notion of death, primarily as being the fate from which no living being can escape. *Kāla* gradually becomes synonymous with death. The deity of time and a god of death form one heavenly being. *Kāla* is the same as *Yama*. Śiva is *Mahākālī*, the Great time and at the same time the Great Death. *Mahākālī* is a form of Durgā which she assumes to bring destruction. Though *Kālī* originally means 'the blue-black', the similarity of sound with *Kāla* must not be altogether neglected. Like Śiva, Viṣṇu has been, also associated with *Kāla*, but time, the general destroyer and giver to life, seems on the whole, more appropriate to the character of Śiva.

Bhartrhari

Bhartrhari has discussed time: What it is and how it functions, in section IX of Kāṇḍa III of his *Vākyaapaḍīya*. This section, herein termed the *Kāla Samuddeśa* contains 114 *Kārikās*. Of these the first 79 *Kārikās* deal with the philosophical views held about time by the various schools of thought, and with the nature and function of time as understood by Bhartrhari himself, and the rest offer well-reasoned justification for the various uses of the tenses in Pāṇini's Grammar, and serve to elucidate the pertinent passages in the Bhāṣya. Before we

reproduce here and discuss the various other theories about time recorded by Bhartṛhari, we propose to put down what this great thinker has to say about time, what is his personal view of it, for that must have precedence over others.

One thing must strike to a critical student of the *Vākyapaḍīya*, is that there is no perfect order in which Bhartṛhari presents the various views about *Kāla*. Usually a verse or two are read to enunciate a particular view. This is followed sometimes by some discussion on questions arising out of a clarification of it; sometimes it is left severely alone with a summary remark. Bhartṛhari glides along in his own masterly way apparently unmindful of setting in complete order what he says. No link is sought to be established between the various views; they are not presented in a string; they lie scattered here and there. Sometimes it is his view, sometimes another's. But whosoever it is, it is always supported and never refuted. Thus the *Kāla Samuddeśa* of his is a veritable repertory of the various theories and views that once held ground and still hold it. (cp. *Kārikās* 57.58 and 68).

Bhartṛhari's Own View

In *Kārikā* 62 of this section, Bhartṛhari sums up the three recognized views about time:

*Śaktiyātmadevatāpakṣair bhinnāṃ Kālasya darśanam*¹

Time is either a *Śakti* or an *Ātman* or a *Devatā*. Helārāja, the commentator tells us that 'time is *Śakti*' is the considered view of Bhartṛhari himself. While commenting on III.9.1.14, he refers to the above *Kārikā* with the words; *ihāpi siddhānta-yiṣyati*. He assimilates the other two views to the first, since, to him they seem to conform to the first in the ultimate analysis. We however differ.

To us it appears that Bhartṛhari acknowledges the other two views as independent notions of time, and not as subordinat to his own. The connecting link placed at the head of the *Kārikā*: 'Now he sums up different views regarding the Reality, Time,' also supports our contention. Besides, we find the echo of the view that *Kāla* is a *devatā* (a deity) in the *Purāṇas*. The *Kūrma Purāṇa* reads :

*anādir eṣa bhagavān kālo ' nanto 'jaraḥ I sarvagatvāt
savatantratvāt sarvātmavān mahāprabhāvaḥ*||⁶²

Helārāja, too notes -

*anye tu vighrahavatim mahāprabhāvaḥ devatām
Kālatvena pratipannāḥ* '

alludes to the view that Kāla is jīva.

True it is that to the author of the *Vākyapadīya*, Kāla is a *Śakti*, and a *Śakti* of Brahman. While discussing the nature of *Śabda-brahman* in Kāṇḍa 1, verse 3, he tells us what he thinks of time.

In his lucid gloss on the said *Kārikā*, he declares it unequivocally that all other generated, dependent subject-forces are pervaded by *kāla*, which alone is independent and follow the operation of this *Śakti* in their working.

How this *Śakti* of Brahman operates and with what results is, given in *Kārikās* 3-8 of this section. We are here told that *kāla* is the instrumental cause in the creation, persistence and destruction of all things that have an origin, etc... *Kāla* seems to be itself diversified by the diversity of limiting adjuncts (*Upādhis*) and then diversifies the things in conjunction with it. Hence (being the instrumental cause), *Kāla* is the string-puller in the dumb show of this world. It is because of the powers of *pratibandha* and *abhyānujñā* that this world comes to possess succession in action. What is the meaning of *pratibandha* and *abhyānujñā*? Bhartṛhari credits *Kāla* with these two effective powers. The first means the preventive power and the second, the permissive power. What leads him to imagine that these two powers must belong to *Kāla*? If there were no *pratibandha*, so argues he, there would be no order in this universe, no progression or regression; there would result perfect chaos, all action being simultaneous. Thus a seed, a sprout, a stem and a stalk—all would emerge and exist together. Therefore all objects having origination, though having peculiar causes, must have *Kāla* as an additional contributory cause for ordered progress.

These two powers namely, *pratibandha* and *abhyānujñā* correspond more or less to the two powers, *vikṣepa* and *āvaraṇa* ascribed to *avidyā* or *māyā* by the later writers on *Advaita*.

Earlier Interpretation Refuted

Helārāja refers to some earlier commentators who take *Śakti* in *Kārikā* 62 referred to above to mean the generating cause which they say is itself time. Their case may be briefly stated as follows :

The power called seed, while it permits the appearance of the sprout, prevents the synchronous growth of the stalk. Similarly the power called sprout permits the production of the next effect, while restraining the production of the subsequent effects. Hence the generating cause is itself time.

This is a wrong interpretation and Helārāja convincingly refutes it. He points out that all this is tantamount to saying that particular effects proceed from particular causes, wherever these (causes) are present, and not otherwise. But since those effects take place at a particular time and not at any time, even when the generating causes are there, the additional regulating cause, namely time, must be acknowledged. The various phases of existence proceeding from a series of causes have a succession; and this succession is a power of *Kāla*, the condition of all being.

To Bhartṛhari, *Kāla* is *one*, it is unitary. It is because of its relation to motions such as of the sun, that *Kāla* becomes many. The great thinker emphatically declares that things are in themselves neither diverse nor uniform. Time is one (indivisible), yet it appears to have so many divisions. How? The essential nature of a substance is, it has to be admitted, not the object of our parlance; it is inexpressible.⁵³ When we conceive unity to inhere in it, we say it is one, when we conceive the white or the dark colour to inhere in it, we say it is white or dark; and when we conceive the universal 'cowness' to inhere in it, we say it is a cow; similarly time comes to have the appellations such as the time of origination, the time of persistence, the time of destruction etc., on account of its conjunction with the action of origination etc. The movements of the sun, the planets and the stars which are in conjunction with time give it the appearance of divisibility; thus the time determined by the sunrise and the sunset is the day; so on and so forth.

If *Kāla* is one, how do we account for the various time-divisions such as the days, months, seasons and years? This question has been raised and discussed at a number of places in the *Vākyapadiya*. The author gives in answer to it in *Kārikā* III. 9.32. The answer is that they are there on account of the diversity of action (*kriyā-bheda*), in external things. These divisions are superimposed upon time and are not integral to it. They do not affect it at all, they make no change to it. Just as a man becomes a carpenter for the time he is chiselling a piece of wood, and a smith when he is forging a piece of iron, but does not cease to be man or get divided into two men; similarly, time is called spring when there appear symptoms like flowers, a kind of humidity in the atmosphere and the charming cooing of the cuckoo. When there appear other symptoms like the falling off of the leaves of the trees, a kind of forbidding chillness in the atmosphere a change in the direction of the sun, we say it is autumn. The spring and autumn are no part of the substance, time. It is a case of an *adhyāsa* (superimposition).

*kriyābhedaḥ yathaikasmīn takṣādyākṛtā pravartate ।
kriyābhedaḥ tathaikasmīn ṛtvādyākhyopapadyate ॥³⁴*

And, if time is eternal and unchangeable, how is it that we hear of such judgments as : It is good time, it is bad time, the *kr̥tayuga* is good and auspicious, the *Kali* is bad and inauspicious? We cannot change time and import external goodness or badness into it. Both goodness and badness are extrinsic to time; they are transferred to it. They originally belong to actions. When good actions are performed, we say it is good time, when bad, we say it is bad time. Time knows no change?

*karṭṛbhedaḥ tadartheṣu pracayāpacayau gataḥ ।
samatvaṁ viśamatvaṁ vā tad ekaḥ pratipadyate ॥³⁵*

To Bhartṛhari, time, though itself unchangeable is the cause of all change, motion and order. Every object is governed by the power of *Kāla*. Why the sun rises and sets at regular hours, why the moon shines for the night and not for the day; why the sun moves for six months along the southern path (*dakṣiṇāyaṇa*) and for another six months along the northern path (*uttarāyaṇa*), why the planets and stars move in a particular

order—all these can only be explained as being due to the all-pervasive and all-powerful nature of *Kāla*. The coming into existence and passing out of existence, the appearance and disappearance of all objects is caused by time alone.

Other differentiations of time are also unreal, they are merely superimposed. A thing *is not* before it actually comes into being; *it is*, when it has been created. The mind, however, conceives it as *one* positive existence. When we set about putting together the competent means to the fulfilment of an act, we say it is Commencement time, when the means thus put together start operating, we say it is Performance time. And when a thing desired to be effected has been accomplished, we say it is Closing time.

Maghaduta of Kāśidāsa

- Jourpoy : Rāmagiri—Alakā
 Route : Rāmagiri—the plateau of Mālā—Mount
 Āmrakūṭa—river Narmadā—āsāṇa country—
 Vidiśā on the river Vetravati—rivers Sindhu and
 Nirvindhya—the country of Avanti—Ujjayinī—
 the stream Gambhīrā—evagiri hill—the river
 Carmaṇvatī—the region of Daśapura—the
 country of Brahmāvarta and Kurukṣetra—the
 river Sarasvatī—Kanakhala—the Mānasa
 Lake—the Mount Kailāsa—the city of Alakā.

Hansadūta of Vāmana Bhattabāna

- Journey : Malaya range—Alakā
 Route : Malaya range (Travancore range)—
 Tāmrparṇī—Madurā—Kāverī—Srīraṅgam—
 cola country—Aruṇācala—kāñci—Kāla-hasti-
 mandira—Kanakamukharī (river)—Kṛṣṇveṇī
 (river)—Tūṅgabhadra—Godāvarī—
 Pañcavaṭī—Vindhyaṇācala—Sarayaū—
 Gaṇḍakī—Kranuṇcaparvata.

Pavanadūta of Dhoyi

- Journey : Malay range—Vijayapura.
 Route : Malay range—Pāṇḍya country—

Tāmraparṇī—Uragapura(Uraiyyur)—
Setubandha Rāmeśvara—Kāñcīpura—
Kāverī—the mount MalayavatūPañcāpsaras
(rake)—Āndhra country—Godāvarī—the city
of Kalinga—Vindhya Pradeśa—Narmadā—
Yayātinagarī—Suhmadeśa—Trivenī—
Vijayanagara (Bengal), the capital of King
Lakṣmaṇasena.

Hansasandesa of Vedāntadesika

Journey : Mount Malayavat—Laṅkā.

Route : The mount Malayavat—Añjanādri
(Veṅkaṭādri)—Kanakamukharī(river)—
Tuṇḍirapradesa—Satyavratākṣetra—Kāñcī—
Sriṅgam—pāṇḍya country—Vṛṣabhādri—
Tāmraparṇī—the mount—alaya—the mount
Suvela(on the shore or the middle of the
ocean)—Laṅkā.

Sukasandesa of Lakṣmidāsa

Journey : Rāmeśvaram — Guṇakāpuram
(Trikkāṇāmatilakam).

Route : Setubandha Rāmeśvaram—along the band of
the ocean—Tāmraparṇī(river)—Maṇālūr, the
capital of the Pāṇḍya kings (Manalor)—
Sahyaparvata—erala country—Syānandūra—
(Trivandrum)Kulapurī—(capital of the Kūpaka
kings) Kolambadeśa (Quilon)—Vallabhagrāma
(Tiruvalla)—Bimbalī—Sindhudvīpa (the can-
tonment of Bimbalī kings (Katalaturuttu)
Phullā(river)—Subrahmaṇya mandira—
Paśupatikṣetra—Cūrṇī(Alwaye or Periyar)—
Mahodayapurī(Tiruvancillulam), the capital of
kerala kings—Guṇakāpurī
(Tirkkāṇāmatilakam).

Kokilasandesa of Uddanda

Journey : Kāñcī—Jayantamaṅgala.

Route : Kāñcī-Kampā river—Kṣīasindhuynadī(Palar)—

Cola country—Bilvakṣetra—Kāverī—
 Hosaladeśa—Lakṣmīnārāyaṇapura—Sahya
 mountain—Kerala region—Vāṇmayī(river)—
 Puralī(Kottayam) Sambradeśa—Koladeśa—
 Kukkutakroda (Calicut) Prakāśadeśa—
 (Vekkattunar)—Svetāraṇya (Triprangor)—Nilā
 (river)—the region of Netranārāyaṇiyya
 Brāhamaṇas—the Raṇakhala region (Plrkal)—
 Vṛṣapurī—Khalapurī (Tiruvancikkul)—Cūrṇī
 (river)—Jayantamaṅgala (Cannamangala).

Indukūta of Vinayavijayagani

Journey : Yodhapura—Sūrat.

Route : Yodhapura (Jodhpur)—the mount
 Suvarṇagiri—the temples of Mahāvīra and
 Pārśvanātha —Jālandhara (jalor)—(the city of
) Rohiṇī—the mount Arbuda (Mount abu) —
 Acalaparovata/Jaina temple of king
 Kumārapāla—Sindhupuram on the banks of the
 river Sarasvatī—the river
 Sābhramatī(Sabarmati) Rājadrāṅga
 (Ahmedabad)—the city of Vā0+apadri
 (Baroda)—Narmadā—Bhṛgupura (Broach)—
 the river Tāpī (Tāpti)—Sūryapura (Sūrat).

Meghadutasamasyāledha of Meghavijaya

Journey : Aurangabad—Dvīpapurī(Div Bandor, Diu,
 Gujarat).

Route : Navyraṅgapurī(Aurangabad)—the mount
 Devagiri—the city of Devagiri—the mount
 Solor—the mount Tuṅgilā—Bhṛgupura
 (Broach)—Narmadā—the river Mahī—Siddha-
 saila—Satruṇīaya (a Jaina pilgrim center)—
 Dvīpapurī (Diu).

Nayūrasandesa of Udaya

Journey : Trivandrum—Kottayam.

Route : Trivandrum—along the coean—Viṣṇu temple
 at Varkala—Quilon—Ingudī country—the capi-

tal city of Kaṇṭiyūr—a Kā;ī temple and the Vallabha temple—the Manikaṇṭha temple—Vaṇṇulā (river)—Kottayam.

Kokasansesa of Visnuvrāta

Journey : Vihārapurī to Kāmārāmā.

Route : Vihārapurī—Varaṇā—the lake of Sundara—the capital city of Sacandrā—the city of Sāntākārā—Ramyā (the river)—the region of Lokabhadra Siva—Ayodhyā—Kāmārāmā.

References

- 1.
2. *Manusmṛti*, 1.24.
3. *Nyāyamañjarī*, 1.1.5.
4. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, I. 2.14.
5. *ibid.*, 1.2.27
6. *ibid.*, 1.2.26
- 7.
- 8.
9. *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 3.8
- 10.
- 11.
12. *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 3.10.22.
13. *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 3.11.3.
14. 3.11.4
15. *Kūrma Purāṇa* quoted in *Vācaspatyakoṣa*, p. 1986.
16. *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* quoted in *Vācaspatyakoṣa*. p. 1986.
17. *Vākyapadiya*, III. 9. 62.
18. *Mahārthamañjarī*, Gāthā 18
19. *Īśvarapratyabhijñānavimarśinī*, 3.1.9.
20. *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā*, 1.10.14
21. *Tripurārahasya*, Jñānakāṇḍa. 4.99.
22. *ibid.*, Jñānakāṇḍa, 14.83.
23. *Dvaitaśakts* 5.7.96.
- 24.
25. *Prayogakramadīpikā*, 1.20
26. *ibid.*, 1.21
- 27.
- 28.

69. *Laghumañjūṣā*, p. 848 (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series)
70. (III. 9. 59-61.),
71. *Vākyapadīya*, III. 9.76.
72. *ibid.*, *avataṛaṇikā*
73. *Vākyapadīya*, III. 9.77

*****g

17. The Principle of Relativity, p. 190.
18. *Rāmacandra*.
19. 'avyuchhinnāḥ' in the above passage means flowing continuously (*pravāharūpenāvīratāḥ*—Śrīdharasvāmivyākhyā).
20. Yoga Sūtra 'and Bhāṣya, 3.57. The original quotation will be given under time in Yoga Philosophy
21. *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, 3.8.11.)
- 22.
- Pārānandasūtra*, 5.6
23. *Mahābhāṣya*, 4.2.3 Kielhorn's Ed. Vol. II., p. 272.
24. *ibid.* Vol. I, p. 7.
25. *ibid.*
Vol, I. p. 409.
24. *ibid.* Vol. I. p. 409.
25. (I.48.)
26. (*Sūtrasthāna*, I.48.)
27. *ibid.*
- 28.
- Kāmasūtra*, *Sādhāraṇādhikaraṇa*, *Adhyāya* 2.
29. (*J aymaṅgalā*, a commentary on the *Kāmasūtra*, *Sādhāraṇādhikaraṇa*, *Adhyaya* 2. Under *sūtra tatsarvam kālakāritam*'.)
- 30.
- 31.
- 32.
34. *Vāsiṣṭha-tātparya-prakāśa* under verse 11.
35. *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. IV. 10. 17—27.
36. Cf. The Concept of Time in Indian Philosophy, p. 35.
- 37.
38. *Vākyapadīya*, III. 11.7
- 39.
- 40.

Kālidāsa's Ṛṣis

Whenever a writer writes something, consciously or unconsciously he weaves his thoughts into it. His work is in a way an extension of his personality. His creation, it reflects his mind.

Unlike modern writers Kālidāsa has said nothing about himself with the exception of a bare mention of his name in one of his dramas but in the course of his works he has left sufficient hints about his way of thinking, the working of his mind to help us sketch a picture of his personality, what he likes and dislikes, his preferences and priorities.

A study of his works reveals that the Ṛṣis occupy quite a substantial part of his thinking. As a matter of fact, the story of the best of his plays, the *abhijñānaśākuntala* he has woven round Ṛṣis, one Ṛṣi who gives birth to Śakuntalā, another one who brings her up, still another one who pronounces a curse on her and the fourth one who affords her shelter after her repudiation.

The position of Ṛṣis in Kālidāsa is that while some find a bare mention in his works in connection with some incident or the other, others find a detailed delineation or play a major role in his themes which runs through them to a considerable extent. In the first category too the Ṛṣis could be subdivided into two, those who fell a victim to the charm of the nymphs and those who could resist it. To the first subdivision belong Ṛṣis like Viśvāmitra and Māṇḍakaraṇi who were enticed by Menakā¹ and five nymphs² respectively. To the other belong Sutikṣṇa whom the blandishments of the nymphs were not able to corrupt³ as also Tṛṇabindu who felt so bad with the nymph Hariṇī that he cursed her to be born a mortal female on the earth.⁴

Kālidāsa utilizes the opportunity of describing Rāma's return to Ayodhyā in the aerial car for referring to a number of Ṛṣis and their Āśramas as the car overflies them. Apart from

the Ṛṣis referred to above, with the exception of Viśvāmitra, those who find mention in the description are Agastya, not referred to by name but by his unique actions of displacing Nahuṣa with a mere frown from the position of Indrahood and clearing turbid water⁵ and Śarabhaṅga who made an oblation of his own body consecrated with Mantras into the holy fire having for long propitiated it with sacred fuel.⁶

The Ṛṣis in the second category, those who find detailed delineation or even if no detailed delineation, play a major role in his works can, on the basis of their temperament and behaviour, be divided into two, those of the fierce type and those of the benign type. In the first category can be put Ṛṣis like Durvāsa and Paraśurāma and in the second Ṛṣis like Kaṇva, Mārīca, Vālmiki and Vasiṣṭha.

Durvāsa who had earned the reputation of quickly flying into rage, सुलभकोपो महर्षिः⁷ finds mention in Kālidāsa's works at least twice, once, in the context of the pronouncement of the curse on the absent-minded Śakuntalā who could not notice his presence though properly announced : अयमहं भोः,⁸ the curse that changed the very course of her life and at another time in the context of Lakṣmaṇa on Rāma's door violating the condition for fear of the curse : भीतो दुर्वाससः शापाद्रामसन्दर्शनार्थिनः,⁹ in that while Kāla in the guise of a Muni would be having secret discussions with Rāma anybody seeing them would have to be discarded.

Like Durvāsa Paraśurāma too is mentioned twice. First time in the context of his sudden appearance and challenge to Rāma, being incensed at the latter's breaking of Śiva's bow at the Sītā svayaṁvara, to put the string on his bow and to pull it¹⁰ which he did and sparing his life, he being a Brāhmaṇa, barred his way to the regions, लोकः, earned by him through sacrifices saving for him his movement, गति, at his request, he having been allowed to choose between the two.¹¹ The second time in the context of Rāma's command to Lakṣmaṇa to drop Sītā in the forest. Lakṣmaṇa had heard of Paraśurāma having dealt a blow to his mother as to a foe at the command of his father : स शृश्वान् मातरि भार्गवेण पितृनियोगात् प्रहृतं द्विषद्वत्.¹² He urged to do what his

brother had asked him to. Killing by Paraśurāma of his mother by cutting off of her head is referred to at his sudden appearance before Rāma as mentioned above : पितुः शासने स्थितिभिदोऽपि तस्थुषा वेपमानजननीशिरश्छिदा.¹³ He is described as रोषपरुषात्मन्,¹⁴ stern in rage and unkind, merciless : येन प्रागजीयत घृणा ततो मही,¹⁵ who first subdued the feeling of kindness and then the earth.

Apart from being mentioned in the context of being enticed by Menakā, Viśvāmitra also finds mention in the context of asking Daśaratha for Rāma for warding off obstruction to his sacrifice¹⁶ on the conclusion of which he took him together with Lakṣmaṇa who had accompanied him from Ayodhyā to Mithilā on an invitation from Janaka to take part in a sacrifice. When the same was over, he conveyed to Janaka Rāma's wish to see the bow. Feeling unsure of his capacity to handle it for his tender age, he could somehow persuade himself to do so by the confidence expressed in him by the sage which he fully justified by lifting the bow and putting the string on it. While taking Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa from Ayodhyā to his Āśrama the sage is said to have been telling them old tales, पूर्ववृत्तकथितैः, he being well-versed in legendary lore : पुराविदः.¹⁷

Of benign Ṛṣis out to help people in distress, we may first take up Kaṇva who picks up an infant Śakuntalā whom even her mother had forsaken, उञ्जितायाः, and brings her up and adopts her as his daughter : शरीरसंवर्धनादिभिस्तातकाश्यपोऽस्याः पिता,¹⁸ though unmarried, शाश्वते ब्रह्मणि स्थितः. He looks to her wellbeing. Sensing that some evil is to befall her he goes on a pilgrimage to Somatīrtha to mitigate it. When of age, he thinks of finding for her a suitable match : अनुरूपवरप्रदाने सङ्कल्पः,¹⁹ सङ्कल्पितं प्रथममेव मया त्वदर्थे भर्तारमात्मसदृशं सुकृतैर्गता त्वम्.²⁰

Overflowing with the milk of human kindness, he approves of Śakuntalā's choice made in his absence, without his knowledge and consent and sends her to her husband's home with all the blessings and words of advice. He feels her absence as any father would do. Though a recluse given to hard penance, तपश्चरणपीडितं तातशरीरम्,²¹ he gives himself over to so much of emotion that it comes to stand in the way of his practice of austerities : काश्यप, तत्स्योऽपरुष्यते तपोऽनुष्ठानम्.²² He is a picture of

kindness, gentleness and holiness, the picture that Kālidāsa draws with consummate skill.

It was Kālidāsa's penetrating vision which could bring forth a R̥ṣi when Śakuntalā was forsaken by her mother. It is that same vision which could bring forth another R̥ṣi, this time Mārīca, interestingly of the same *gotra* as Kaṇva : दुष्यन्तः-भगवन्! इमामाज्ञाकरिं वः प्रत्यादिशन्नपराद्धौऽस्मि युष्मत्सगोत्रस्य कण्वस्य²³, when she was forsaken by her husband. He gave her shelter and brought up, as she was earlier by Kaṇva, her son whose rites also he performed²⁴ and solicitous of his well-being gave him a protective rosary, रक्षाकरण्डक, which when picked up by a person from the earth other than one's own self or parents would turn into a snake and bite.²⁵ It was in his Āśrama that Śakuntalā was united with her husband. It is he who gives the forecast about Duṣyanta's son that he is going to be a Cakravartin : तथा भाविनमेनं चक्रवर्तिनमवगच्छतु भवान्²⁶ to be called Bharata by bringing about the welfare of his subjects, though called Sarvadamana in the Āśrama : पुनर्यास्यत्याख्यां भरत इति लोकस्य भरणात्²⁷.

It is given to the R̥ṣis of Kālidāsa to give shelter and protection to the forsaken, the cast out. After Kaṇva and Mārīca comes Vālmiki. While her husband forsakes Sītā in an advanced stage of pregnancy in a dreary forest, it is Vālmiki who following her cries, तद्दुदितानुसारी,²⁸ comes to her and takes her to his Āśrama. So intensely does he feel for the hapless lady that he is resentful of Rāma for being unreasonable to her for no cause : त्वां प्रत्यकस्मात् कलुषप्रवृत्तावस्त्येव मन्युर्भरताग्रजे मे.²⁹ He acts as a father to her and asks her to feel that she has come to her father's house with only a different location. That he was a father to her is acknowledged by Rāma as well when he speaks of Sītā as his (Vālmiki's) daughter-in-law : तात शुद्धा समक्षं नः स्नुषा ते जातवेदसि.³⁰ With none to look to, it was Vālmiki who had come to Sītā's rescue. So complete was his owning of Sītā and the intensity of his desire that she should be rehabilitated that when Rāma offered him his kingdom³¹ on being told by Kuśa and Lava that the Rāmāyaṇa that they were singing and which had captivated his heart was composed by him (Vālmiki), he, the tender-hearted one, काव्यगिरिः, asked for only the acceptance by

him of Sītā : ऋषिः कारुणिको वब्रे सीतायाः सम्परिग्रहम्.³² On Rāma promising that he would do so, on the condition that she should convince his subjects of the purity of her character, he has her brought from his Āśrama through his pupils much in the same way as he would his suprehuman power, सिद्धि, through the austerities : शिष्यैरानाययामास स्वसिद्धिं नियमैरिव³³ which is achieved through hard penance. To refer to Sītā as the very सिद्धि, is the height of owning somebody. Of all the sages and seers of Kālidāsa it was given to only the two, Kaṇva and Vālmīki to so completely own those forsaken by mother and husband that one, Śakuntalā for the former becomes his very life breath, भगवतः कण्वस्य कुलपतेरुच्छ्वसितम्³⁴ and the other, Sītā, for the latter his very superhuman power, सिद्धि. Vālmīki also performs the sacraments according to Śāstraic rites of Sītā's sons, teaches them the Vedas with their subordinate subjects and makes them sing his own composition, the path way first shown to the poets :

सञ्चस्कारोभयप्रीत्या मैथिलेयौ यथाविधि।
सङ्गं च वेदमध्याप्य किञ्चिदुत्क्रान्तशैशवो॥
स्वकृतिं गापयामास कविप्रथमपद्धतिम्॥³⁵

The next one in the series of shelter-givers is Cyavana in whose Āśrama Uravaśī leaves her son secretly as a trust with Satyavatī, one of the female ascetics, as soon as born, on account of the compulsion of the curse that she would have to be back to heaven the moment she were to see his face : उर्वशी ततो महाराजवियोगभीरुतया जातमाल एव विद्यागमनिमित्तं भगवतश्च्यवनस्याश्रमे एष पुत्रक आर्यायाः सत्यवत्या हस्ते अप्रकाशं निक्षिप्तः.³⁷

It is the sage who performs his birth rites : जातकर्मादिविधानं तदस्य भगवता च्यवनेनाशेषमनुष्ठितम्, teaches him and trains him in archery : गृहीतविद्यः धनुर्वेदेऽभिविनीतः.³⁷

Every Āśrama has its code of conduct. Anyone violating it has no place in it. Both Sarvadamana and Āyus being Kṣatriya lads had violated it in that they were found to have been oppressing the animals and birds in it. Theirs was the आश्रमविरुद्धवृत्ति.³⁸ They, therefore, had to leave their respective Āśramas. In the case of one, things were so arranged that the father took him away. In the case of the other, he was returned to his mother

under the orders of the sage : तत उपलब्धवृत्तान्तेन च्यवनेनाहं समादिष्टा
निर्यातय एवमुर्वशीहस्ते न्यासमिति.³⁹

The creatures in the Āśrama were looked upon as the very children of the hermits : नः अपत्यनिर्विशेषाणि सत्त्वानि.⁴⁰ Even if wild, they would get tamed by contact with the hermits : तपस्विसंसर्गविनीतसत्त्वे तपोवने⁴¹ and were not to be killed. That is why the request of the hermits to Duṣyanta not to kill the Āśrama deer : आश्रममृगोऽयं न हन्तव्यो न हन्तव्यः.⁴²

It is meditation, ध्यान, that they practise, that the R̥ṣis come to have suprehuman powers. The seers, they are able to see through the past, present and the future with their eye of knowledge⁴³ which they come to acquire through ध्यान⁴⁴ or प्रणि धान. When Dilīpa approaches Vasiṣṭha and tells him of his issuelessness, he goes into meditation, for a moment : क्षणमात्रमृषिस्तस्थौ ध्यानस्तिमितलोचनः⁴⁵ and then everything is clear to him : सोऽपश्यत् प्रणिधानेन सन्ततेः स्तम्भकारणम्.⁴⁶ The issuelessness is due to the curse that the divine cow had pronounced on him due to her non-circumambulation by the king on his way to the earth.⁴⁷ The sad condition of Aja at the sudden loss of his wife also he comes to know while in his Āśrama through meditation : प्रणिधानाद्गुरुराश्रमस्थितः विजज्ञिवान्.⁴⁸ Vālmīki too comes to know through meditation जाने विसृष्टां प्रणिधानतस्त्वां मिथ्यापवादक्षुभितेन भर्ता,⁴⁹ of the forsaking of Sītā by her husband disturbed by false slander. Māricā too comes to know through meditation, when Menakā comes to his wife Dākṣāyaṇī with repudiated Śakuntalā that she has been refused by Duṣyanta on account of Durvāsa's curse which is to terminate with the sight of the ring;

यदैवाप्सरस्तीथावितरणात्प्रत्याख्यानवैक्लव्यां शकुन्तलामादाय मेनका
दाशायणीमुपगता तदैव ध्यानादवगतोऽस्मि दुर्वाससः शापादियं तपस्विनीं
सहधर्मचारिणीं त्वया प्रत्यादिष्टा, नान्यथेति, स चायमङ्गुली-
कदर्शनावसानः.⁵⁰

In the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* at the time of Śakuntalā's departure when the two sons of the R̥ṣis, the R̥ṣiskumāras, go, on being asked by Kaṇva to gather for Śakuntalā flowers from trees something unusual happens. The trees bring forth to them the silken garment, the lac dye as also the ornaments which are the pre-

sents from sylvan deities through them for the departing lady.⁵¹ Due to his power even the trees are at the command of Kaṇva and render him service, the सेवा, referred to by one of the Ṛṣis : एह्येहि, अभिषेकोत्तीर्णाय भगवते काश्यपाय निवेद्याव यावदिमां वनस्पति- सेवाम्.⁵² When Duṣyanta enquires of the sages escorting Śakuntalā of the well-being of Kaṇva their reply is that those possessed of the superhuman powers have their well-being under their control : स्वाधीनकुशलाः सिद्धिमन्तः.⁵³

Through their सिद्धि, the superhuman power itself they can ward off any evil. In their presence the evil-minded demons can cause no obstruction to the sacrifices. The sons of the Ṛṣis while approaching Duṣyanta with the request to stay on in the Āśrama for a few days refer to the fact of the absence of Kulapati (Kaṇva) for the obstruction to their sacrifices : तत्रभवतः कुलपतेरसान्निध्वाद्रक्षासि न इष्टिविघ्नमुत्पादयन्ति.⁵⁴ Had Kaṇva been present, the demons, as is deducible from their remarks, would not have been able to do so and through his superhuman power itself he would have kept them at bay.

It was this superhuman power again which had enabled him to know what had happened to Śakuntalā and why. At the suggestion of Aditi after the union of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā that Kaṇva be made acquainted with the accomplishment of the wishes of his daughter Mārīca's comment is : तपः प्रभावात् प्रत्यक्षं सर्वमेव तत्रभवतः,⁵⁵ through the power of penance everything is present before the eyes of His Reverence, thus solving the mystery as to why Kaṇva whose very life-breath Śakuntalā was : सा खलु भवगतः कण्वस्य कुलपतेरुच्छ्वसितम्,⁵⁶ had not reacted at the most cruel treatment that Duṣyanta had meted out to her. This also comes as an explanation to Duṣyanta as to why the sage had not been very angry with him : अत एव खलु मम नातिक्रुद्धो मुनिः.⁵⁷ Though realizing that Kaṇva is in the know of everything, Mārīca agrees with Aditi's suggestion to convey the news to him and asks Gālava to go by the aerial path for the purpose: गालव इदानीमेव विहायसा गत्वा तत्र भवते कण्वाय प्रियमावेदय.⁵⁸ Going by the aerial path also is a proof positive of the superhuman power of the Ṛṣis.

The superhuman power is referred to in the *Raghuvamśa* as well. When Dilīpa goes to Vasiṣṭha's Āśrama and has to stay on there for sometime to render service to Nandinī, the latter makes arrangement for his stay that is suited to a forest life though having तपः सिद्धि superhuman power, due to ripe asceticism, (he could well have made other types of arrangements as well which could have been befitting his royal status):

सत्यामपि तपः सिद्धौ नियमापेक्षया मुनिः।

कल्पवित् कल्पयामास वन्यामेवास्य सविधाम्।⁵⁹

The R̥ṣi was so powerful that his animals were safe from attack from any quarter. Nandinī refers to this when she calls out to the king expecting the swoop of the lion on him, to get up and the king does not find the lion. According to Nandinī on account of the power of the R̥ṣi even the god of death cannot strike her, much less other destructive animals : ऋषिप्रभावान्मयि नान्तकोऽपि प्रभुः प्रहर्तुं किमुतान्यहिंसाः.⁶⁰

Kālidāsa's study reveals that there were certain R̥ṣis who were associated with some royal families as their preceptors. As Kulagurus they looked to their well-being. Whenever the kings were in difficulty, they repaired to them for help and assistance which they provided through advice and spiritual power. One such R̥ṣi was Vasiṣṭha. Dilīpa refers to what he means to him and his family. He is the averter for him of the divine and man-made calamities ; दैवीनां मानुषीणां च प्रतिहर्ता त्वमापदाम्.⁶¹ Through his Mantras alone he would discomfit his enemies : तव मन्त्रकृतो मन्त्रैर्दूरात्प्रशमितारिभिः.⁶² For the scions of the race of Ikṣvāku the achievement of anything difficult just depended on him : इक्ष्वाकूणां दुरापेऽर्थे त्वदधीना हि सिद्ध्यः.⁶³

The efficacy of the *Mantra*-s of Vasiṣṭha is referred to in the case of king Atithi, the son of Kuśa, too with the only difference that there is no mention of the futility of the arrows : प्रत्यादिश्यन्त इव मे दृष्टलक्ष्यभिदः शराः.⁶⁴ referred to in the case of Dilīpa. There is reference, however, of the combination of the two, the *Mantras* and the arrows which would accomplish just anything:

वसिष्ठस्य गुरोर्मन्त्राः सायकास्तस्य धन्विनः।

किं तत्साध्यं यदुभये साधयेयुर्न सङ्गताः॥⁶⁵

While in the case of Dilipa he himself goes to Vasiṣṭha and places his problem before him, in the case of his grandson Aja it is Vasiṣṭha who sends one of his pupils with words of consolation to steady him while he was completely distraught at the sudden loss of his beloved wife to the point of losing all interest in life.⁶⁶ Nobody had reported the condition of the king to the Rṣi. He had come to know, as stated earlier, of it while in his Āśrama through contemplation and thinking that as the family preceptor it was his duty to stabilize the king had sent his pupil, showing thereby as to how solicitous he could be as a family priest of the king and what kind of relationship subsisted between the two. So concerned was he of the disturbed condition of the king that he would have himself come along to him but for the fact he was tied up with a sacrifice which was still unfinished : असमाप्तविधिर्यतो मुनिः.⁶⁷

Since the Rṣis as preceptors were doing so much for the kings, it was but natural that they (the kings) should show them utmost respect. When they see Vasiṣṭha and Arundhatī, Dilipa and Sudakṣinā fall at their feet : तयोर्जर्ग्हितुः पादान् राजा राज्ञी च मागधी.⁶⁸ It is only after Vasiṣṭha had allowed him that he takes Nandini's milk that she had offered him : स नन्दिनीस्तन्यमनिन्दितात्मा .
..... पयो वसिष्ठेन कृताभ्यनुज्ञः.⁶⁹

It was not only to the family preceptors, the कुलगुरुs, alone that the utmost respect was shown even by the mightiest of the mighty, it was shown to any Rṣi, even while he was not present. When the young sages like Śarṅgarava and Śāradvata in Kaṇva's Āśrama proceed to tell Duṣyanta of his message, the latter says : किमाज्ञापयति भगवान्.⁷⁰ What does His Reverence command? He always addresses Mārica as भगवन्.⁷¹ Not only to a Rṣi, due respect would be shown even to his pupils. An emperor like Raghu would himself come out to receive a young graduate like Kautsa, the pupil of the sage Varatantu with an honorific offering.⁷² When the young sages Śarṅgarava and Śāradvata approach Duṣyanta, he is found already to have left his seat and waiting for them : पुरोहितः भो भोस्तपस्विनः! असावन्नभवान् ... प्रागेव मुक्तासनो वः प्रतिपालयति.⁷³ He also bows to them : सर्वान् अभिवादयते.⁷⁴ Earlier he

asks the royal priest to introduce them to him after receiving them with Vedic rites while he would wait for them in a place proper for meeting the ascetics.⁷⁵

As the preceptors were exerting so much for the kings even to the extent of using their spiritual power for their well-being acquired by them after hard penance and austerities, they could not evidently put up with any kind of offence or dereliction on their part. They probably would have flared up at this which would have brought the chill down the spine of the kings for, anything could happen to them then. The lion in his advice to Dilīpa to desist from offering himself in exchange for the cow refers to this : अथैकधेनोरे पराधचण्डाद् गुरोः कृशानुप्रतिमाद् बिभेषि,⁷⁶ in case you dread the fire-like preceptor who with an only cow will be burning with anger at your offence.

While some of the R̥ṣis were family priests to the kings, the others were having friendly relations with them. Vālmiki, while addressing Sītā refers to his friendship with her father-in-law (Daśaratha) : तवोरुकीर्तिः श्वशुरः सखा मे⁷⁷ (which is an additional reason for him to be kind to her). The fact is referred to again in the context of the performance of the purificatory ceremonies of Lava and Kuśa where in addition to Daśaratha he is said to be a friend of Janaka as well : सखा दशरथस्यापि जनकस्य च मन्त्रकृत्⁷⁸ Viśvāmitra too is referred to as the friend of Daśaratha : पूर्ववृत्तकथितैः पुराविदः सानुजः पितृसखस्य राघवः.⁷⁹ As it is, the word सखा carries in it an element of intimacy.

The R̥ṣis seemed to have very long lives. In the *Raghuvamśa* there is mention for the first time of *Vasiṣṭha* in the context of Dilīpa. The last time that he is mentioned is in the context of Atithi, the son of Kuśa who is seventh in line from Dilīpa. It is interesting that the same R̥ṣi continues for seven generations!

As for the word R̥ṣi it is variously used. Sometimes the same person is referred to as R̥ṣi at one place and Muni at another. The sons of R̥ṣis, the R̥ṣikumāras, coming to Duṣyanta with the request to stay in the Āśrama refer to Kaṇva as Mahārṣi : ततश्चतुर्दशस्य महर्षेरसान्निध्यात्.⁸⁰ At other places he is referred to as Muni, e.g., अनुयास्यन् मुनितनयाम्,⁸¹ अतः खलु मम नातिक्रुद्धौ मुनिः.⁸² It is not only the holiest of the holy like Kaṇva or Mārīca, who are

referred to as Ṛṣis, even their young pupils are done so. Duṣyanta refers to them as such : वेत्तवति! किमुद्दिश्य भगवता काश्यपेन मत्सकाशमृषयः प्रेषिताः स्युः⁸³ for what purpose the revered Kāśyapa would have sent the Ṛṣis to him? Vetravati too calls them as such : सुचरितनन्दिन ऋषयो देवं सभाजयितुमागता इति तर्कयामि,⁸⁴ methinks, rejoicing at the good conduct of His Majesty the Ṛṣis have come to congratulate him; also देव प्रसन्नमुखवर्णा दृश्यन्ते, जानामि विश्रब्ध कार्या ऋषयः,⁸⁵ the Ṛṣis have bright facial expression, methinks, they have come on peaceful errand. The royal priest presenting them to the king refers to them as तपस्विन्ऽः एते विधि वदर्चितास्तपस्विनः,⁸⁶ here are the ascetics given due honour. The king enquiring of them of the well-being of the inhabitants of the Āśrama refers to them as Munis : अपि निर्विघ्नतपसो मुनयः?⁸⁷ That all the ascetics carried the appellation of Ṛṣis, is clear from their sons being referred to as Ṛṣikumāras or Ṛṣikumārakas.⁸⁸ That the words Ṛṣi and Muni were promiscuously used is also clear from the seven Ṛṣis sent by Śiva to Himālaya for begging the hand of his daughter for him. They are referred to at one place as Ṛṣis : ऋषीञ्ज्योतिर्मयान् सप्त स्मर स्मरशासनः⁸⁹ and at another place as Munis : गगनादवतीर्णा सा रेजे मुनिपरम्पराः.⁹⁰

The same also is clear from Viśvāmitra being referred to in the *Raghuvamśa* in the same context as Ṛṣi in some places : धन्विनौ तमृषिमन्वगच्छताम्,⁹¹ नेतुमैच्छदृषिः,⁹² तत्र दीक्षितमृषिं ररक्षतुः,⁹³ प्रत्युवाच तमृषिर्निशम्यताम्,⁹⁴ and Muni at others : तं दिदेश मुनये सलक्ष्मणम्,⁹⁵ मुनेस्तौ प्रपद्य पदवीम्,⁹⁶ विद्ययोः पथि मुनिप्रदिष्टयोः, मुनेः प्रपादस्तम्,⁹⁷ आससाद मुनिः शिष्यवर्गपरिकल्पिताहुर्णम्,⁹⁸ राघवान्वितमुपस्थितं मुनिम्.⁹⁹

A further proof for this are the remarks of one of the two Ṛṣikumāras who came to the king with the request to stay in the Āśrama for a few days. The majestic figure of the king at the first sight so impresses him that he finds him in no way different from Ṛṣis : उपपन्नमेतद् ऋषिम्यो नातिभिन्ने राजनि.¹⁰⁰ Finding in him all that goes with a holy person he calls him in the subsequent remarks as मुनि with the only difference that the word राजन् precedes it : पुण्यः शब्दो मुनिरिति मुहुः केवलं राजपूर्वः.¹⁰¹ At a number of places Duṣyanta for his being a Kṣatriya is called राजर्षि. The same is the case with Viśvāmitra. The above analysis would

lead us to conclude that according to Kālidāsa all the holy people in the Āśrama, the Tāpasas, could be alternatively designated as Ṛṣis, seers or Munis, sages, possessing as they did through the austerities that they practised the characteristics of both. The only difference between them and the seniors like Kaṇva, Mārīca, Viśvāmitra and so on was that the latter were almost always referred to with the honorifics like भगवान्, तत्त्वभवान्. Further, they were not simply called ऋषिः, they were called महर्षिः.

Some of the Ṛṣis like Vasiṣṭha, Mārīca and others were married and had wives like Arundhatī and Āditi, who were themselves highly revered for their spiritual attainments.¹⁰² While one, Arundhatī, sitting behind her husband is compared to svāhā, the wife of Agni : अन्वासितमरुन्धत्या स्वाहयेव हविर्भुजम् the other, Āditi, is spoken of as sharing the offerings in the sacrifices with her husband : यज्ञभागेश्वरम् द्वन्द्वं दक्षमरीचिसम्भवम्. The householder's life came in no way in the performance of austerities of the Ṛṣis.¹⁰³ They had children, as should be clear from the frequent mention of the Ṛṣikumāras and engaged themselves in teaching, performing sacrifices and practising penance. Some other Ṛṣis like Kaṇva were total celibates : भगवान् शाश्वते ब्रह्मणि स्थित इति प्रकाशः.¹⁰⁴ They looked upon the whole Āśrama as their family, though having no family of their own.

Three of the Ṛṣis are mentioned by Kālidāsa as Kulapatis : Kaṇva,¹⁰⁵ Vasiṣṭha¹⁰⁶ and Viśvāmitra.¹⁰⁷ A special designation, Kulapati is explained both by the *Padmapurāṇa* and some other Purāṇas quoted in the *Arthadyotanikā* commentary of Rāghavabhaṭṭa. According to the *Padmapurāṇa* a Kulpati is one who teaches a large number of pupils, is foremost among Munis and is occupied with *Vratas* and *Yajñas* :

आचार्यो बहुशिष्याणां मुनीनामग्रणीस्तु यः।
व्रतयज्ञादिकर्माद्यः स वै कुलपतिः स्मृतः॥¹⁰⁸

According to the other *Purāṇa* quoted in the *Arthadyotanikā* Kulpati is that Brahmarṣi who teaches ten thousand Munis by providing them food, etc. :

मुनीनां दशसाहस्रं योजनदानादिपोषणात्।

Three of the Ṛṣis are mentioned by Kālidāsa to whom the Mantras were revealed : Vasiṣṭha,¹¹⁰ Varatantu¹¹¹ and Vālmīki.¹¹² Of these Varatantu is spoken of as the foremost.

A lady and a young one at that, practising severe penance must have been rather unusual to excite the curiosity of the Ṛṣis who are said to have come to see her brushing aside all considerations of age :

कृताभिषेकां हुतजातवेदसं त्वगुतरासङ्गवतीमधीतिनीत्।
दिदक्षवस्तामृषयोऽभ्युपागमन् न धर्मवृद्धेषु वयः समीक्ष्यते॥¹¹³

Whenever kings arranged big sacrifices, they invited Ṛṣis to them. Janaka invited Viśvāmitra to his sacrifice : तं न्यमन्त्रयत् सम्भृतक्रतुर्मथिलः.¹¹⁴ Rāma invited to his sacrifice Maṇḍikarīpa from several quarters : दिग्भ्यो निमन्त्रिताश्चैनमभिजग्मुर्महर्षयः.¹¹⁵ They were shown great reverence¹¹⁶ and at the conclusion of the sacrifice were given a send off with gifts.¹¹⁷

Once in the works of Kālidāsa the Ṛṣis are shown on a different mission viz., begging the hand of Pārvatī for Śiva from Himālaya. On this mission they are accompanied with Arundhatī who could be, as Śiva thought, particularly useful as an elderly lady for the purpose.¹¹⁸ Aṅgiras served as their spokesman on the occasion.

Not all the Ṛṣis had their abode on the earth. Some had it on the stars. Invited by Rāma the Ṛṣis had come to him leaving not only their earthly abodes but also the starry ones :

न भौमान्येव धिष्यानि हित्वा ज्योतिर्मयान्यपि॥¹¹⁹

Since they had their abode on the stars, the seven Ṛṣis, are said to be of the luminous form : ऋषीञ्ज्योतिर्मयान् सप्त सस्मर स्मरशासनः.¹²⁰ When they made their appearance before Śiva they are said to have illumined the sky with their halos :

ते प्रमामण्डलैर्व्योमं द्योतयन्तस्तपोधनाः.¹²¹

Some of the Ṛṣis were quite adept in handling arms along with practising penance and austerities. It was Cyavana who had trained Ayus, the son of Urvaṣī in archery : धनुर्वेदं भिनीतः.¹²² It was from Viśvāmitra that Rāma had got the missile with its Mantra which was capable of destroying demons : नैऋतघ्नमथ

मन्त्रवन्मुनेः प्रापदस्त्रमवदानतोषित्.¹²³ Paraś urāma carried both a rosary of beads in his right ear : अक्षबीजवलयेन निर्बभौ दक्षिणश्रवणसंस्थितेन यः¹²⁴ and also arms like the battle axe to which he refers in the context of the possibility of Rāma feeling scared of it : कातरोऽसिः तर्जितः परशुधारया मम¹²⁵ and the bow. It was the latter which he had placed before Rāma asking him with a view to testing his strength, to put the string on it and applying the arrow on it draw it : तन्मदीयमिदमायुधं ज्यया सङ्गमम्य सशरं विकृष्यताम्.¹²⁶ A great warrior, his missile had remained unimpeded even against the Krauñca mountain: बिभ्रतोऽस्त्र- मचलेऽप्यकुण्ठितम्.¹²⁷

Even though recluses, leading a secluded life in a forest, the *R̥sis* were, conversant with worldly affairs. Kaṇva's statement : बनौकसोऽपि सन्तो लौकिकज्ञा वयम्¹²⁸ is fully corroborated by the advice that he, the bachelor one, gives to the young bride Śakuntalā as she is getting ready to leave for her husband's home which draws the remark from even the seasoned lady like Gautamī that was all the advice that could be given to a bride : एतावान् बधूजनस्योपदेशः.¹²⁹ After goin through it one comes to agree in full with Śāraṅgarava's comment that there is nothing beyond the reach of the wise : न खलु धीमतां कश्चिदविषयो नाम,¹³⁰ the comment that he had offered on Kaṇva's statement as quoted above.

There is reference in the context of the *R̥sis* to the Vedas, the *R̥gveda* and the *Atharvaveda* in the works of Kālidāsa. The saga Vasiṣṭha is said to be the repository of the Ātharvanic lore : अथर्वनिधिः.¹³¹ The sage Vālmiki coming to Rāma with Sītā and her two sons is said to be approaching the refulgent sun with *R̥gvedic* Mantra (Sāvitrī) accompanied by proper intonation and purity :

स्वरसंस्कारवत्यासौ पुत्राभ्यामथ सीतया।

ऋचेवोदचिषं सूर्यं रामं मुनिरुपस्थितः॥¹³²

While Śakuntalā is getting ready to leave for her husband's home, Kaṇva pronounces blessings on her in *R̥gvedic* metre
ऋक्छन्दसाऽऽशास्ते.¹³³

A couplet in the *Raghuvamśa* mentions the hermits returning from other forests being welcomed by the holy fires in

invisible forms : *पूर्यमाणमदृश्याग्निप्रत्युद्यातैस्तपस्विभिः*.¹³⁴ Mallinātha reproduces here two quotations which uphold the poet's statement' one, *प्रोष्यागच्छतामाहिताग्नीनामग्नयः प्रत्युद्यान्ति*, when those who keep fires return after being away, the holy fires receive them, two, *कामं पितरं प्रोषितवन्तं पुत्राः प्रत्याधावन्ति, एवमेतमग्नयः प्रत्याधावन्ति*, just as sons run to the father returning from a visit from outside, so do the fires him (who keeps them).

Kālidāsa has the greatest respect for the holy people of whatever age group. If there be ascetics on the one hand and the king on the other, it is the king who has to bow to them. It is he who has to leave his seat. The request of the ascetics he has to take as command. The contribution of the ascetics is more valuable to him than even the heap of jewels. Their share to the State is their penance which is imperishable.¹³⁸ It is they who sustain it. At the back of the State power lies the spiritual power.

Note : The references and the quotations in the article are from Kālidāsa's text as given in the *Kālidāsagra-nihāvalī*, edited by Rewa Prasad Dwivedi, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 1976. The Act number from the dramas and the Canto number as also the verse number from the poems have been added to facilitate consultation from other editions.

References

1. अनसूया-अस्ति कोऽपि कौशिक इति गोत्रनामधेयो राजर्षिः। गौतमीतीरे पुरा किल तस्य राजर्षेः उग्रे तपसि वर्तमानस्य किमपि जातशङ्केद्रैवैर्मनका नामाप्सराः प्रेषिता नियमविघ्नकारिणी। ततो वसन्तोदारमणीये समये तस्या उन्मादयितुं रूपं प्रेक्ष्य।
Abhijñānaśākuntala (abh. Ś.), Act I. p. 440
2. पुरा स दर्भाङ्कुरस्मालवृत्तिश्चरन् मृगैः सार्धमृषिमधोना।
समाधिभीतेन किलोपनीतः पञ्चाप्सरोयौवनकूटबन्धम्॥
Raguvamśa (Raghu), XIII, 39, p. 205.
3. असौ तपस्यत्यपरस्तपस्वी नाम्ना सुतीक्ष्णश्चरितेन दान्तः।

नलं विकर्तुं जनितेन्द्रशङ्कं सुरङ्गनाविभ्रमचेष्टितानि॥

ibid., XIII. 42, p. 205.

4. चरतः किल दुश्चरं तपस्तुण्यविन्दोः परिशङ्कितः पुरा।

प्रजिघाय समाधिभेदिनीं हरिस्मै हरिणीं सुरङ्गनाम्॥
स तपःप्रतिबन्धमन्युना प्रमुखाविष्कृतचारुविभ्रमाम्।
अशपद् भव मानुषीति ताम्,

ibid., VIII, 80, p. 163.

The reference to Hariṇī occurs in the context of Indumatī's sudden death from the accidental fall of a wreath from Nārada's Viṇā. Vasiṣṭha in his words of consolation to Aja recounts the incident to tell him of the actual position with his wife, who, being in reality a nymph turned into a human being through curse, had to go back to heaven. The inevitability of it he should accept and not grieve. The curse was limited by the sage to the sight of divine flowers.

ibid., XIII. 412, p.205.

5. ध्रुमेदमात्रेण पदान्मघोनः प्रभ्रंशयां यो नहुषं चकार।
तस्याविलाम्भःपरिशद्धिहेतोर्भौमो मुनेः स्थानरिग्रहोऽयम्॥

ibid., XIII. 45, p. 206.

6. अदः शरण्यं शरभङ्गनाम्नस्तपोवनं पावनमाहिताग्नेः।
चिराय सन्तर्प्य समिद्धिरग्निं यो मन्त्रपूतां तनुमप्यहौषीत्॥

ibid., XIII.45, p. 206.

7. *Abh.Ś.*, Act IV, p. 478.
8. *ibid.*, Act IV, p. 477.
9. *Raghu*. XV. 94, p. 227

10. मैथिलस्य धनुरन्यपार्थिवैस्त्वं किलानमितपूर्वमक्षणोः।
तन्निशम्य भवता समर्थये वीर्यशङ्कमिव भग्नमात्मनः॥

ibid., XI. 72, p. 189.

- ॥. न प्रहर्तुमलमस्मि निर्दयं विप्र इत्यभिभवत्यपि त्वयि।
शंस किं गतिमनेन पत्त्रिणा हन्मि लोकमुत ते मस्त्रार्जितम्॥

ibid., XI 84, p. 190.

12. *ibid.*, XIV. 46, p. 215.
13. *ibid.*, XI. 65, p. 188.
14. *ibid.*
15. *ilbid.*

16. कौशिकेन स किल क्षितीश्वरो राममध्वरविधातशान्तये।
कपक्षधरमेत्य याचितस्तेजसां हि न वयः समीक्ष्यते।

ibid., XI. 1., p. 183.

17. *ibid.*, XI. 10, p. 183.
18. *Abh.Ś.* Act I., p.440.
19. *ibid.*
20. *ibid.*, Act IV, p. 488.
21. Prof. Sures Vast Shastri Collecti
22. *ibid.*, p. 492.

23. *ibid.*, Act VIII, p. 557.

24. मारीचः-वत्स! कच्चिदभिनन्दितस्त्वया विधिवदस्माभिरनुष्ठितजातकमादिक्रियः पुन
एष शाकुन्तलेयः?

राजा - भगवता कृतसंस्कारे सर्वमस्मिन्नाशास्महे।
ibid., p.558.

25. *ibid.*, p. 551.

26. *ibid.*, p. 558.

27. *ibid.*

28. *Raghu.*, XIV. 70, p.217.

29. *ibid.*, XIV. 73. p. 217.

30. *ibid.*, XV. 72, p. 225.

31. अथ सावरजो रामः प्राचेतसमुपेयिवान्।

ऊरीकृत्यात्मनो देहं राज्यमस्मै न्यवेदयत्॥

ibid., XV. 70, p.225.

32. *ibid.*, XV. 71, p. 225.

33. *ibid.*, XV. 74, p. 225.

34. *Abh.Ś.*, Act. III, p. 459.

35. *Raghu.*, XV. 31, p.221.

36. *Vikramorvaśīya* (*Vikr.*), Act V. p. 418.

37. *ibid.*, p. 414.

38. *Abh.Ś.*, Act VII, p.549.

39. *Vikra*, Act V, p. 415.

40. *Abh.Ś.*, Act VII, p.549.

41. *Raghu.*, XIV. 75, p. 217.

42. *Abb.Ś.*, Act I, p. 431.

43. पुरुषस्य पदेष्वजन्मनः समतीते च भवच्च भावि च।

स हि निष्प्रतिधेन चक्षुषा त्रितयं ज्ञानमयेन पश्यति॥

Raghu., VIII, 78, p. 163.

Though said with reference to Vaisiṣṭha it can apply to any Ṛṣi.

44. There is a picturesque description of the meditation practised by the Ṛṣis through the Posture called Vīra, requiring as it does tremendous fortitude with its total stillness in the context of the mention of the penance grove of Atri by Rāma on the way from Lāṅkā to Ayodhyā. It is said that even the trees standing in the middle of altars with their stillness for absence of wind appear to be practising Yoga :

वीरासनैर्ध्यानजुषामृषीणाममी समध्यासितवेदिमध्याः।

निवातनिष्कम्पतया विभान्ति यौगाधिरूढा इव शाखिनोऽपि॥

Raghu., XIII.52, p. 206.

45. *ibid.*, I.73, p. 109.

46. *ibid.*, 1.74, p. 109.

47. धर्मलोपभयाद्राज्ञीभूतुस्नातामिमां स्मरन्।
प्रदक्षिणक्रियाह्वयां तस्यां त्वं साधु नाचरः॥

अवजानासि मां यस्मादतस्ते न भविष्यति।

मत्प्रसूतिमनाराध्य प्रजेति त्वां शशाप सा॥

ibid., I.

48. *ibid.*, VIII. 75, p. 163.

49. *ibid.*, XIV. 72, p. 217.

50. *Abh.Ś.*, Act VII, p. 557.

51. क्षौर्म केनचिदिन्दुपाण्डु तरुणा माङ्गल्यमाविष्कृतं

निष्कृत्युतश्चरणोपभोगमुलभो लाक्षारसः केनचित्।

अन्येभ्यो वनदेवताकरतलैरापर्वभागोत्थितै-

र्दत्तान्याभरणानि तत्किंसलयोद्भेदप्रतिद्वन्द्विभिः॥

ibid., Act IV., p. 485.

52. *ibid.*

53. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 50.

54. *ibid.*, Act II, p. 456.

55. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 559.

57. *ibid.*, Act III, p. 459.

58. *ibid.*

59. *Raghu.*, 1.94, p. 111.

60. *ibid.*, II.62, p. 117.

61. *ibid.*, I.60, p. 108.

62. *ibid.*, I.61, p. 108.

63. *ibid.*, 72, p. 109.

64. *ibid.*, I. 61, p. 108.

65. *ibid.*, XVIII, 38, p. 239.

66. अभिषङ्गजडं विजज्ञिवानिति शिष्येण किलान्वबोधयत्।

67. *ibid.*, VIII. 76, p. 163.

68. *ibid.*, I. 57, p. 107.

69. *ibid.*, II. 69, p. 118.

70. *Abh.Ś.*, Act V, p. 501.

71. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 557, p. 557-8. When Mārīca asks Duṣyanta to leave for his capital he says : यदाज्ञापयीत भगवान्।

72. स मृन्मये वीतहिरण्मयत्वात्पले निधायार्धमनर्घशीलः।

श्रुतप्रकाशं यशसा प्रकाशः प्रत्युज्जगामातिथिमातिथेयः॥

Raghu., V.2, p. 134.

73. *Abh.Ś.*, Act V, p. 501.

74. *ibid.*

75. राजा— तेन हि मद्वचनाद्विज्ञाप्यतामुपाध्यायः सोमरातः अमूनाश्रमवासिनः श्रौतेन विधिना सत्कृत्य स्वयमेव प्रवेशयितुमर्हति इति। अहमप्यत्र तपस्विदर्शनोचिते प्रदेशे स्थितिः प्रतिपालयामि।

Abh.Ś., Act V, p. 498.

76. *Raghu.*, II.49, p. 116.
 77. *ibid.*, XIV. 74, p. 217.
 78. *ibid.*, XV. 31, p. 221.
 79. *ibid.*, XI. 10, p. 83.
 80. *Abh.Ś.*, Act II, p. 456.
 81. *ibid.*, Act I, p. 442.
 82. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 559.
 83. *ibid.*, Act V. p. 498.
 84. *ibid.*
 85. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 500.
 86. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 501.
 87. *ibid.*
 88. *ibid.*, Act I, p. 455; Act IV, p. 485.
 89. *Ku. Sam.*, VI.3, p. 76.
 90. *ibid.*, VI.49, p. 80.
 91. *Raghu.*, XI.5. p. 183.
 92. *ibid.*, XI.6, p. 183.
 93. *ibid.*, XI. 24, p. 185.
 94. *ibid.*, XI.41, p.186.
 95. *ibid.*, XI.2, p.183.
 96. *ibid.*, XI.7, p.183.
 97. *ibid.*, XI.21, p.184.
 98. *ibid.*, XI.23, p.185.
 99. *ibid.*, XI.35, p.186.
 100. *Abh. Ś.*, Act II, p. 455, p.186.
 101. *ibid.*
 102. *Raghu.*, I.56., p. 107. Interestingly the world used for अग्नि here is हविर्भुज् which is just the right one to compare the Ṛṣi with. The couple born of Dakṣa and Marīci is said to be removed just one degree from the Creator : इन्द्रं दक्षमरीचिसम्भवमिदं तत्सन्तदुरेकान्तरम्,
Abh.Ś., Act VII, p. 556.
 As a devoted wife Dakṣāyaṇī wants to know from her husband the duties of the wives devoted to the husbands which he explains to her with the other wives of the Ṛṣis :
 मातालिः—अये वृद्धशाकल्य! किमनुतिष्ठति भगवान् मारीचः? (आकर्ण्य) किं ब्रवीषि?
 दाक्षायण्या पतिव्रताधर्ममधिकृत्य पृष्टस्तस्यै महर्षिपत्नीसहितायै कथयतीति।

ibid., p. 546

Apart from the expression महर्षिपत्नीसहितयै, accompanied with the wives of the Mahārṣis, with reference to Dākṣāyaṇī above there is reference to the wives of the R̥sis in the *Raghuvamśa* in the description of the Āśrama of Vasiṣṭha who looked up on the deer as their off spring.

आकीर्णमृषिपत्नीनामुटजद्वाररोधिभिः।

अपत्यैरिव नीवारभागधेयोचितैर्मृगेः।

103. The classic example in this case could be Mārica whose hard penance is described by Mātali in the following stanza :

वल्मीकाग्रनिमग्नमूर्तिरुरसा सन्दष्टसर्पत्वचा

कण्ठे जीर्णलताप्रतानवलयेनात्यर्थसम्पीडितः।

अंसव्यापि शकुन्तनीडनिचितं बिभ्रज्जटामण्डलं

यत्र स्थाणुरिवाचलो मुनिरसावध्यर्कबिम्बं स्थितः॥

“Immovable like the trunks of the tree, stands the yonder sage, facing the sun's orb with his body half-buried in an anti-hill, with his breast closely covered over with sloughs of serpents, hard pressed at the throat with a ring of withered tendrils of creepers, and wearing a mass of matted hair overspreading his shoulders and closely filled with birds' nests (Translation from M.R. Kale). Duṣyanta also calls the R̥sis as कष्टतपस्, of hard penance : नमोऽस्मै कष्टतपसे.

104. *Abh. Ś.*, Act I. p. 440.

105. For Kaṇva :

1. वैखानसः— एष खलु कण्वस्य कुलपतेरनुमालिनीतीरमाश्रमो दृश्यते।

राजा — अपि सनिहितोऽन्नः कुलपतिः?

2. राजा — अपि नाम कुलपतेरियमसवर्णक्षेत्रसम्भवा स्यात्?

ibid., Act I, pp. 432, 436.

106. For Vasiṣṭha :

निर्दिष्ट्यं कुलपतिना स पर्णशालाम्।

Raghu., 1.95, p. III.

107. For Viśvāmitra : ऋत्विजः कुलपतेर्यथाक्रमं वाग्यतस्य निरवर्तयन् क्रियाः

ibid., XI. 30, p. 185.

108. *Abh. Ś.* ed. M.R. Kale. Gopal Narayen & Co., Bombay, 1920.

109. *ibid.*, p. 14.

110. For Vasiṣṭha : तव मन्त्रकृतो मन्त्रैर्दूरात्प्रशमितारिभिः

Raghu., V. 4, p. 134.

111. For Varatantu :

अप्यग्रणीर्मन्त्रकृतामृषीणां कुशाग्रबुद्धे कुशली गुरुस्ते

ibid., V. 4. p. 134.

112. For Vālmiki : सखा दशस्थस्यापि ज्ञातव्यं च मन्त्रकृतः

ibid., XV. 31. p. 221

113. *Ku. Sam.*, V. 16, p. 70.

114. *Raghu.*, XI. 32, 185.

115. *ibid.*, XV. 59, p. 224.

116. Rāma is said to have given a send off to the Ṛṣis at the conclusion of his sacrifice where the gifts are said to have been the tears of the friends : ऋषीन् विसृज्य यज्ञान्ते सुहृदश्च पुरस्कृतान्
ibid., XV. 86, p. 226.

Nandargikar reads here सुहृदश्च पुरस्कृतान् in place of Rewa Prasad Dwivedi's सुहृदश्च पुरस्कृतान्, Whatever the reading, the Ṛṣis being पुरस्कृत honoured, with gifts at the conclusion of the sacrifice is evident from it.

117. Rāma's grandson Atithi at the conclusion of his sacrifice is said to have honoured priests with rich gifts :

ऋत्विजः स तथाऽऽनर्च दक्षिणाभिर्महाक्रतौ।

यथा साधारणीभूतं नामास्य धनदस्य च॥

Raghu., XVII. 80, p. 243.

118. आर्याऽप्यरुन्धती तन्न व्यापारं कर्तुमर्हति।

प्रायेणैवविधे कार्ये पुरन्ध्रीणां प्रगल्भता॥

Ku. Sam., XI. 32, p. 78.

119. *Raghu.*, XV. 59, p. 225.

120. *Ku. Sam.*, VI. 3, p. 76.

121. *ibid.*, VI. 4, p. 414.

122. *Vikr.*, Act V, p. 414.

123. *Raghu.*, XI. 21, p. 184.

124. *ibid.*, XI. 66, p. 188.

125. *ibid.*, XI. 78, p. 189.

126. *ibid.*, XI. 77, p. 189.

127. *ibid.*, XI. 74, p. 189.

128. *Abh. Ś.*, Act IV, p. 491.

129. *ibid.*

130. *ibid.*

131. *Raghu.*, I. 59, p. 108.

132. *ibid.*, XV. 76, p. 225.

133. *Abh. Ś.* Act. IV, p. 486.

134. *Raghu.*, I. 49, p. 107.

135. राजा— मुखं! अन्यमेव भागमेते तपस्विनो निर्वपन्ति यो रत्नराशीनपि विहायाभिनन्दते।
पश्य

यदुत्तिष्ठति वर्णेभ्यो नृपाणां क्षयि तत्फलम्।

तपःपद्भागमक्षय्यं ददत्यारण्यका हि नः॥

Abh. Ś., Act II, p. 454.

The Kumārasambhava - Its Genuine Portion

The Kumārasambhava (K.S.) as available at present has seventeen cantos which carry on them the commentary Sañjivani by Mallinātha on Cantos I-VIII and by Sītārama Kavi on Cantos IX-XVII. The expression in all these is not the same, giving rise, therefore, to a controversy, not yet fully resolved, as to whether the whole of the work is that of Kālidāsa or a certain portion of it. A fairly good number of scholars is of the opinion that the genuine portion of the work is upto Canto VIII only, after which it is all interpolation. And there are powerful arguments for it. Later scholars like Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Mammaṭa and Ānandavardhana in their discussions on certain words, themes and figures of speech have given quotations from the work upto Canto VIII only thereby giving rise to the conjecture that in their time the work had these cantos only and not upto Canto XVII or they did not accept cantos IX to XVII as genuine to draw their material on.

Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita has referred to the K.S. a number of times: *giriśaṁ upacacāra* (K.S. I.60), *viṣavṛkṣo'pi saṁvardhya* (II.55), *tulāmm̐ yadārohati dantavāsasā* (V. 34), *vimānaṁ subhru* (V.43), *viññāpanā bhartṛṣu* (VII.93), *dūrayatyā vanate vivasvatī* (VIII.31), *pīvaroru pibatīva barhiṇaḥ* (VIII.36), *śārvarasya tamasaḥ* (VIII. 57).

Śaraṇadeva has referred to the K.S. thirty times to justify the apparently unjustifiable words. And each time it has been from within the portion upto Canto VIII only.

Appayya Dīkṣita (in his *Citramīmāṃsā*) has quoted twelve, Ānanda-varḍhana six and Mammaṭa nine stanzas from the K.S. and all these are from the first eight cantos only.

A point well-noticed by scholars already against the portion of the K.S. beyond Canto VIII as genuine is that Mallinātha

has not commented on it.

An examination of the two portions of the *K.S.* also leads to the same conclusion. The first portion (upto Canto VIII) has no frequentative form while the second (from Cantos IX-XVII) has a few of them e.g. *lelihāna* (XVI. 16), *dodhūyamāna* (XVII.30), *dandahyamāna* (XVII.39).

The first portion does not have a word with *akac* while the second one has it : *ahakapramukhyān* (XII.46). The second portion furnishes instances of hiatus when followed by *o* en-joined by Pāṇinī by *ot* (I.1.15), e.g. *aho aho devagaṇāḥ* (XII. 54), *atho acumbat* (XIII.19), *itthaṁ vilokya surasainyam atho aśeṣaṁ* (XVII.33) while the first portion has nothing of the kind. The words *giriśa* and *praphulla* occur four times each in the first portion: *giriśena paścāt* (I.37), *giriśo 'numene* (I.59), *giriśam upacacāra* (I.60), *giriśāya gaurī* (III.65), *praphullarājīvaṁ iv nīkamadhye* (III.45), *praphullakāśā vasudheva reje* (VII.11), *praphullavṛkṣaiḥ kaṭakairiva svaiḥ* (VII.52), *praphullacakṣuḥ kumudaḥ kumāryā* (VII.74), while they just do not figure in the second. Unlike the first portion there is tautology in the second, e.g., *ratānanda-sukhasya* (IX.16), *adhikakāntikāntaḥ* (XIII,8) *vihārahelāgatibhiḥ* (IX.37), *nirdagdham a tmano dehaṁ durvaḥaṁ voḍhum akṣamaḥ* (X.13.), *sāndrapramododayasaukhyahetubhūtam* (X.19), *kalahakelikutūhalotkam* (XVII.12.). There is a whole lot of made-up words in the second, particularly with reference to Kumāra (Skanda), Indra and Candra but not in the first section.

Made-up words for Kumāra

Smarārātisutaḥ (XII.47), *Andhakārātisutasya* (XIII.17.), *Adriputrīmaheśaputrāya* (XIII. 29), *Smarāśatrusūnuḥ* (XIII. 33), *Śailasutātānūjaḥ* (XIII. 45), *Andhakaśatrusūnunā* (XIV. 1), *Andhakadveṣitanūjam* (XIV. 8), *Tripurntak ātmajam* (XIV. 9), *Manmathamardanātmajam* (XV.2), *Manmathaśatrusūnunā* (XV.3), *Smarārisūnoḥ* (XV. 38, 40; XVII. 6), *Purārisūnoḥ* (XV. 49; XVII. 7), *Tripurāriputram* (XVII. 18), *Makaradhvajāśatrusūnum* (XVII. 46), *Tripurārisūnum* (XVII. 48), *Viṣamaśarāreḥ sūnuna* (XVII. 55)

Made-up word for Indra

Pulomaputrīdayitaḥ (XII. 22; XIII. 9)

Made-up word for Candra (moon)

Triyāmaramaṇaḥ (XIII. 8)

Unlike his successors like Bhāravi and Māgha, Kālidāsa is not in the habit of using unfamiliar words. Occurrence of some of them like, *krpīṭayoni* (X. 16) for fire, *saṅkrandana* (XII. 3) for Indra, *Kāsara* (XIV. 7) for he-buffalo in the second part is a clear departure from the Kālidāsan practice. So is the eulogy for the celestial Ganges (X. 28-36) which is reminiscent of later *śloka* type of poetry.

Along with tautology could be mentioned unnecessary padding which is noticeable in the second portion. In *Tripurāsurāri* (XIII. 20), the word *asura* is unnecessary. Śiva is always called *Tripurāri*. *Asura* is just a padding here. In *raṇapravīro hi surān avocat* (XIII. 13.), *hi* is superfluous-though the commentaries like *Śiśutoṣinī* have tried to offer justification for it by pointing out that it denotes certainly, *hi niścayaḥ* which, however, is a weak defence. The use of *hi* in the present case is not in the same strain as in *kleśaḥ phalena hi punar navatām vidhatte*.

Kālidāsa is known for his similes which have a charm of their own. He is very frequent with them as also very original. While there are numerous similes in the first portion, there are just six of them in the second which considering its volume is rather a small number and they too lack the charm and the felicity of those in the first as also Kālidāsa's other works.

In the case of a son, Kālidāsa's practice as noticeable in his various works is that he either relates him to the father or the mother but never to both, e.g. *babhūva bhāveṣu dilīpanandanāḥ* (*Raghuvamśa*, III. 41); *dilīpasūnoḥ sa brhadbhujāntaram* (III. 54); *Sudakṣiṇāsūnur api nyavartata* (III. 67); *daṣyantīm apratiratham* (*Abhijñānśakuntala*, IV. 20); *kaccid abhinanditas tvayā eṣa śakuntaleyaḥ* (VII. 32/33) where Raghu is referred to as the son of Dilipa or of Sudakṣiṇā, and Bharata, of Duṣyanta or of Śakuntalā. The same practice is met with in the first portion of the K.S. where Pārvatī is spoken of as the daughter of the mountain (*Himalāya*) *saṁlāmajā*,

adritanayā and so on. In the second portion, however, Kumāra (Kārttikeya) is spoken of as the son of Śiva and Pārvatī, not always as the son of either Śiva or of Pārvatī which should have been the case keeping in view the Kālidāsan practice, e.g., *maheśādrisutāsutāsyā* (XI. 39); *girīśagaurītanayena* (XIII. 9); *adriputrīmaheśaputrāya* (XIII. 29); *tanayo'si girīśagauryoḥ* (XVII. 14).

One more argument against Kālidāsa having composed the work upto Canto XVIII could be that instead of naming his work *K.S.*, he would have named it, keeping in view the victory over the villain, *Tārakavadha* like the Prakrit works *Kāmsavaho*, *Gaudavaho* or named it *Tārakavijaya*, victory over Tāraka, in line with the titles like *Haravijaya*.

It may well be argued here as to how the work could be named *K.S.*, the birth of Kumāra, if the genuine portion of it is to be accepted to be upto Canto VIII only, for it does not describe the birth of Kumāra. The answer to this could be that with the marriage of Śiva and Pārvatī and their union, the birth of a son could be an obvious deduction.

All this would point out to the portion upto Canto VII being that of Kālidāsa. What follows might well have been composed by a later writer to ensure its perpetuity ascribed to the master poet.

Sanskrit Language and Literature : A Study in Environment

For ages Indians have attached great importance to environment. There has been a family relationship of sorts between them and the flora and fauna around them. Śakuntalā, the heroine of Kālidāsa's immortal play the *Abhijñānśākuntala*, had adopted a deer as her foster son whom she had brought up by offering a handful of black wild rice and nursed its wound by pouring Ingudi oil in its mouth when it got pierced with sharp blades of Kuśa grass. It is this deer which clinged to her and pulled her garment, *atha ko 'yaṁ vasane me sajjate*, when she was proceeding to her husband's home:

*yasya tvayā vṛṇaviropaṇam ingudīnām
tailaṁ nyāṣicyata kuśasūcividdhe
śyāmākamuṣṭiparivardhitako jahāti
so 'yaṁ na putrakṛtakāḥ padavīm mṛgs té "*

The family was not restricted only to living beings; it extended even to inanimate things like trees with all their six varieties, the shrubs, the creepers, (*latā*), the winding plants (*vallī*) the bamboos (*tvaksara*) and the reeds, the straw, the grass and other plantations in this category (*īṛṇajāṭī*). The *Mahābhārata* finds great virtue in planting them. The trees are the sons, says the great work, for one who plants them *tasya putrā bhavanty* etc.,² and it is his bounden duty to look after them and bring them up *putravat paripālyāś ca putrās te dharmataḥ smṛtāḥ*.³ They serve the deities with shade. The Kinnaras, the serpents, the demons, the celestial beings, the Gandharvas, the human beings—all depend upon them. With their flowers and fruits they satisfy the humankind. One who gifts them, they liberate in this world and the world beyond.

It is not only human beings who would adopt them as sons, even the gods would do so.

In the conversation between Dilipa and lion in the *Raghuvamśa* the lion refers to a tree, the Devadāru, which had been adopted by Lord Śiva as His son with Goddess Parvati Herself watering It:

*amum purah paśyasi devadāruṃ
putrīkṛto 'sau vṛṣabhadhvajena
yo hemakumbhastananiḥsṛtānām
skandasya mātulḥ payasām rasajñāḥ'*

When once a wild elephant while scratching its temple had rubbed it off its skin, Pārvatī was overpowered with grief much like the grief she had felt when her son Skanda was smitten all over with the missiles of the demons:

*kaṇḍūyamānena kaṭam kadācid
vanyadvipenonmathitā tvag asya
athainam adres tanayā śuśoca
senānyam ālīḍham ivāsurāstraiḥ'*

It is in India that mountans and rivers have been accorded the character of divinity. The Himālaya is *devatātmā* here like the Gaṅgā, the Godāvarī, the Kāverī. The rivers are the means to salvation, *mokṣadāyikāḥ* here. It is again here that trees and plants have been invested with divinity and are worshipped in all reverence. The Lord proclaims *Aśvattha*, the Peepul tree, as His own form: *aśvatthaḥ sarvavṛkṣāṇām* It is said that one who plants five *āmras* (literally the word means a mango tree but in its extended meaning has come to denote a tree in general)-the five trees, does not go to hell. The trees are:

*aśvattha ekaḥ picumarda eko
dvau campakau trīṇi ca kesarāṇi
saptaītha tālī navanārikelāḥ
pañcāmraṇopī narakam na yāti'*

The enumeration is according to the *Tithitattva*. According to the *Varāhapurāṇa* it is:

*aśvattham ekaṃ picumardam ekaṃ
nyagrodham ekaṃ daśa puspajālīḥ
dve dve tathā dāḍimamātulāṅge
pañcāmraṇvāpī narakam na yāti'*

The nature of the *amras* as would be clear from the above differs, except for *aśvattha* and *picumarda*, in both the texts.

While in the *Tithinirṇaya* they are *aśvattha*, *picumarda*, one each, two *campakas*, three *kesaras*, seven *tālās* (palm trees) and nine *nārikelas* (coconut trees), in the *Varāhapurāṇa* they are *aśvattha* and *picumarda*, one each, one *nyagrodha*, ten *puṣpajātis*, and *dāḍima* (pomigrenate) and *matulaṅga*, two each. The figure five, *pañca*, in the stanzas seems to be just indicatory *upalakṣaṇa*. The number totals up, according to the first stanza to twenty three, according to the second one seventeen. Anyway, what is significant here is the importance given to the plantation of the trees. Not to go to hell is the motivation mentioned here to entice people, *prarocanā*, to go in for this which should weigh with them.

After planting the trees have to be nurtured by watering. For watering also there is the incentive, the *prarocanā*, viz., satisfying the manes: *āmrās ca siktāḥ pitarāś ca prinitah*, you water the *āmrās* (trees) and satisfy the manes. Welll, with one stroke you achieve two goals : *ekā kriyā dyarthakarī prasi - ddhā*.* What better than this?

It is also that where there is grove of Tulasī plants, the repetition of the Lord (Hari) and a congregation of His devotees, the Lord (Hari) is present there Himself:

*tulasīkānaṇaṁ yatra hareḥ sankīrtanaṁ tathā
tadbhaktasamavāyaś ca tatra sannihito hariḥ*

The leaves of the mango, the *bilva* and the plantain trees are sacred to Indians. So are the coconut fruits, the betel leaf and the arecanut which serve as offering to gods. Of the types of grass or straw it is *kuśa* which steals the palm, its mats occupying the pride of place in auspicious ceremonies. With so much holiness surrounding trees, plants, rivers, lakes, mountains, animals and birds it was unthinkable that Indians would countenance any damage to them.

They were conscious that while they need environment, the environment too needs them. The respect for nature and the concept for environmental harmony have been woven in Indian psyche through scriptures, religious codes and mythology. The ancient Indians understood and underscored the interrelatedness of their own selves and the Mother Nature. This idea gets expressed in Sanskrit literature in a telling manner. For instance, the *Mahabharata* says that without a forest cover

the tiger is slain, without a tiger the forest is felled. Hence a tiger should protect the forest and the forest should protect the tiger:

*nirvano vadhyate vyāghro nirvyāghram chidyate vanam
tasmād vyāghro vanam rekṣed vanam vyāghram ca pālayeṭ'*

The entire approach of ancient Indians to environment was prompted by feeling of devotion, reverence, compassion and gratitude. This had helped them solve most of the environmental problems in a friendly manner. They wanted peace and harmony in every particle of environment as indicated by their plentiful prayers in that direction one of which, an oft-quoted one, from the *Atharvaveda* begs for peace on the earth, the mid-region, the earth, the waters, the herbs, the plants and so on, peace and peace everywhere : *om dyauḥ śāntir antarikṣam śāntiḥ pṛthivī śāntiḥ āpaḥ śāntiḥ oṣadhyāḥ śāntiḥ*¹⁰

The ancient seers of India have been holistic in their approach to existence. They had realized early enough the interdependence and the cooperation necessary among the forces of human and non-human nature.

It is an interesting fact that happenings with human beings would cast their shadow on the entire environment which reflected their mood in a mirror as it were. Śakuntalā's departure from the hermitage for her husband's home did not sadden her friends and foster father only. The female deer, the peacocks and the creepers too felt likewise:

*udgalitadarbhakavalā mrgyaḥ parityaktanartanā mayūrāḥ
apasṛtapāṇḍupatrā muñcanti aśrūṇīva latāḥ.*¹¹

"The female deer vomitted the morsel of *kuśa* grass, the peacocks gave up dancing. The creepers with yellow (withered) leaves appear as if shedding tears".

The same is the response of the natural surroundings when Duṣyanta is overpowered with remorse for having repudiated Śakuntalā for no reason disbelieving all her pleadings for being his wife:

*cūtānām ciranirgatāpi kalikā badhnāti na svam rajah
saṁnaddham yad api sthitam kurabakam tat korakāvasthayā
kañheṣu skhalitam gate 'pi śiṣre puṁskokilānām rutam
śaṅke saṁharati smaro 'picakitas tūṇārdhakṛṣṭam śaram*¹²

"The bud of the mango, though long since burst forth, does not form (develop) its pollen; the *kurabaka*, although protruded, remains in the state of a bud; the cooing of the male-cuckoos falters in their throat, though winter has passed; meseems, even the God of Love puts back, in fear, his arrow half-drawn out of the quiver."

In India the earth is accorded the status of mother. In the *Pr̥thivīsūkta* of the *Atharvaveda* the Ṛṣi proclaims that he is the son of the earth: *mātā bhūmih putro aham pr̥thivyāḥ*. It is in India alone that forgiveness is begged of the earth for setting foot on it, the mother, the adored and the revered :

*samudraraśane devi parvatastanamaṇḍite
viṣṇupatni namas tubhyaṁ pādakṣepaṁ kṣamasva me* ¹³

The same kind of forgiveness is begged of a tree by a carpenter for felling and sawing it for the wood needed for fashioning doors and windows of a house :

*yānīha bhūtāni vasanti tāni
baliṁ gr̥h̥tvā vidhivat prayuktam
anyatra vāsam parikalpayantua
kṣamantu te cādya namo 'stu tebhyaḥ* ¹⁴

While referring to the earth it will not be out of point to make a reference to an episode where it figures with environmental overtones. Once while King *Pr̥thu* was on the throne the earth went to *Brahmā* and complained to Him that the king was tormenting her. On being summoned, the king told the Lord that he was doing so because the earth was not yielding sufficient food his subjects. In self-defence the earth said that it was so because the subjects had far too much exploited her upper crust with the result that her productivity had declined. *Brahmā* then asked the earth to assume the form of a cow and supply the milk (the remainder of it after the calf had sucked) to the subjects to hold on. This went on well for some time after which *Pr̥thu* went to *Brahmā* and told him that his subjects were feeling uneasy; they wanted shelter now. *Brahmā* advised that they could dig into the earth for putting up pillars for building house but then the digging has to be done gently without hurting the earth too much. The Lord also advised the earth to withstand the hurt caused to her by digging and

pounding. The above episode exemplifies the concern of the ancient Indians to soil erosion that is what the loss of the upper crust is a fact to which the present-day agricultural experts and environmentalists are drawing pointed attention. Further, indiscriminate digging and pounding, and that too deep, is certain to cause upheaval in the ecology which could be detrimental to the natural state of the earth.

There is an intimate connection of trees with human beings. The very idea of *dohada*, the desire of plants at budding time, owes itself to it. Certain trees like *Aśoka* flower when kicked by young ladies, *Bakula* when sprinkled by mouthfuls of liquor by the same, the *Karṇikāra* when touched by them. The Sanskrit literature is full of references to such phenomena the poets often describing them in all their vividness. Connected with the natural phenomena reflecting the mood of a human being is the fact that it is the natural phenomena that not unoften influence the mood of a human being.

While speaking of colour it may not be out of place to mention that the coming together of the contrasting colours of black and white is taken in Indian tradition to have an impact in adding to the attractiveness, particularly in the case of women who have white complexion. Sanskrit literature is full of several instances of the same; *Rāma* was dark *Sītā* white; *Kṛṣṇa* was dark *Rādhā* was white. Pointing to the dark-complexioned *Pāṇḍyan* king the ruler of *Uragapura* in the South as a possible choice for *Indumatī* the *Vidarbha* princess of white complexion, her friend *Sunandā* who was taking her from one prince to the other, says that should she choose him, their union could be like that of the cloud and the lightning: *saṅgas tadittodayayor ivāstu*.¹⁵ Apiece with the above is the description of the coming together of the white waters of the *Gaṅgā* and the dark ones of the *Yamunā* at their confluence at *Prayāga*.

Just as a sad incident casts its shadow on the environment, in the same way happy one even if yet to take place provides cheer to it. With the birth of *Raghu* the quarters get brightened, the holy fire receives the oblations with its flame turning to the right and the pleasant breeze begins to blow: '

*diśaḥ prasedur maruto vavuh sukhāḥ
pradakṣiṇārcir havir agnir ādade*¹⁶

The same thing happened when Lord Buddha appeared on the earth. As a matter of fact, the omens good or bad, are woven into the lives of the human beings which they affect and reflect. Whenever something bad is to happen to them like the death of a great personality, the defeat in a battle or visitation of a calamity the entire atmosphere comes to portend it : Dusty winds begin to blow, the light of the sun goes dim, the jackals begin to growl, the asses start baying, the owls begin to hoot, dogs give out moaning sound, the dusky clouds appear in the sky. Sanskrit literature of all ages is replete with such descriptions, the descriptions of bad omens the *ghora nimittas* or the *viparitanimittas* (cf. *Gītā, nimittāni ca paśyami viparītāni Keśava*)¹⁷

The Indians accept this creation to be made up of the *Pañcamahābhūtas* the Five Great Elements, *Prthivi*, *Ap*, *Tejas*, *Vāyu*, and *Ākāśa*, the earth, water, fire, wind and ether. For its (creation's) wellbeing perfect equilibrium in them is necessary. Prayers were offered to this end in ancient India.

It was an ancient custom which some families still observe to set aside five morsels, *pañcagrāsas* as offerings to *Pañcamahābhūtas* before partaking of food. These morsels would go to crows and other birds who would feast on them. The society would thus help these creatures with the necessary weherewithal to survive, they being as much an essential part of it as anything else.

There has never been a systematic attempt to eliminate the birds of prey like eagles or vultures as at present. They are the nature's scavengers preying upon cremation or burial or just unclaimed bodies or the bodies of the medicants which are outside the purview of cremation as per the custom for them and are just to be left as they are with no obsequies even in societies like those of the Hindus, the Jains, the Buddhists which otherwise, in the case of the laity, cremate them. There was a news item recently that the absence of these birds in some places had created a problem for the municipal authorities for the disposal of the dead bodies of the animal near total absence of these birds of prey.

It is not sheer mythology that eagles like *Jaṭāyu* and *Sampāti* were friends of *Daśaratha*. The friendship between human

beings and the most ferocious of animals and birds is not an impossibility. It is this friendship that would have prompted Jaṭāyu, a *grdhra*, an eagle, to stake its life for the sake of Sītā, the daughter-in-law of its friend Daśaratha.

The interdependence of the human existence and the other creatures cannot be better illustrated by a belief prevalent among Indians, assiduously fostered and nurtured by astrologers that malefic effect of certain stars and planets in the horoscopes of certain individuals can be mitigated by daily offerings of grains like millets (*Bājra*) or maize to birds and wheat flour to insects, a common sight in Indian parks, roads or streets or parapets. The practice springs from the belief that these offerings going to these creatures would intercede on their behalf with the adverse effect of the planetary position to make it more malleable. Whatever the basis of the belief, it did help sustain the upkeep of the non-human creatures by impelling the humans to help them survive even with the selfish motive of helping themselves. This was an indirect and a very ingenious way of emphasizing interdependence; the non-human creatures helping the humans; in reducing the impact of their impending adversity and the humans responding to this by offering food.

Life in India had been so intimately connected with nature, the flowers, the leaves, the trees, the birds, the animals that a large corpus of words have come to be connected with it. In them the natural phenomena serve as standards of comparison. Quite a few of the idioms and proverbs owe their origin to the association with them. It would be a subject for a Ph.D. or D.Litt. Thesis to gather such words and expressions from Sanskrit literature to show as to how what human beings see and experience around them gets embossed on their psyche.

Of the flowers the Indians were most familiar with and for which perhaps there was great fascination is lotus. Even though immersed in mud, *paṅka*, it remains unsoiled with it investing it with exceptional beauty and sacredness. Its becoming symbolic of exceptional beauty and charm are indicative of good luck. It is accorded the special position of springing forth from the navel of Brahmā. Serving as the seat or the pedestal for Lakṣmī, Lord Viṣṇu holds it in one of His hands. So does Padmapāṇi, one of the forms of the Lord Buddha. One of the

sacred texts of the Buddhists goes by the name of *Lotus Sutra*.

For expressing the beauty, the charm, the delicacy of the limbs of the human body like the eyes, the hands, the feet, the face it is lotus which is pressed into service. We have such expressions as *netrakamala*, *ambujalocana*, *kamalalocana* (*pañiyam pātum icchāmi tvattaḥ kamalalocane*), *karakamala*, *caraṇakamala*, *pādāmbuja*, *pādapaṅkaja*. The light dark complexion finds its comparison in the same of the blue lotus *nīlāmbujaśyamalakomalāṅgam*. The languor of the beloved is compared to a lotus stalk in a state of blooming and non-blooming in a cloudy day: *sābhe 'hnīva sthalakamlinīm na prabuddhām na suptām*. Coming back to the eyes we find them often enough expressed with reference to fish, *mīna*, *mīnākṣī* or deer, *hariṇākṣī*: *hāro 'yam harinākṣinām luṭhati sthanamandale* or the young one of the deer: *mṛgaśāvākṣī* or the lotus leaf, *kamalapatrākṣī padmapalāśakṣī*. The elegant gait is expressed through swan, *hamsagati*; the leisurely one through elephant: *gajagāminī*. The melodious voice finds its parallel in the cooing of the cuckoo and dance through that of peacock. Looking back while moving on is *siṃhāvalokana*. The overall view is *vihaṅgāvalokana*. For expressing the deeds of a halfwicked person, *khala*, mosquito is the example: *sarvaṃ khalasya caritaṃ maśakaḥ karoti*. It is a dog which is an example for one who demeans himself for a pittance and an elephant for one who shows his dignity in accepting the offer, *bhumau nipatya vadanodaradarśanaṃ ca svā piṇḍadasya kurute gajapuṅgavas tu dhīraṃ vilokayati cātusatais ca bhūṅkte*.

A *Mahābhārata* stanza has a full horde of animals, birds and reptiles to serve as examples for a king to mould his actions. He is advised to have an eye of an eagle, the stillness of a crane, the action of a dog, the push of a lion, the suspiciousness of a crow and in all equanimity act like a snake :

*grdhradrṣṭiḥ bakālīnaḥ śvaceṣṭaḥ siṃhavikramaḥ
anudvignaḥ kākaśaṅkiḥ bhujāṅgacaritaṃ caret* ¹⁸

For highlighting the qualities of human beings it is the animals, birds and insects more often than not that come in handy to Sanskritists. A brave man or a man pre-eminent of a class is *narasiṃha* or *puruṣasiṃha* (*udyogināṃ puruṣasiṃham*

upaiti laskmīh) *naravyāghra* or *naraśārdula* (*uttiṣṭha naraśārdula*) man-tiger, a man with large feet is termed *vyaghrapāda*. The excellence is expressed by different words for a bull : *vṛṣa* or *vṛṣabha prācetaso munivṛṣā vṛṣabhaḥ kavinām*, *prācetasa* the best of the sages and the best of the poets; or *ṛṣabha naraṣabha* or *puṅgava narapuṅgava*, the best of the men, *paṇḍitapuṅgava*, the foremost among the learned. For deceit and chicanery it is *baka*, a crane which is pressed into service, that being taken to the ultimate in cunning and craft, *haitukān bakavṛttīnś ca vāmātrenāpi naccayet*. Of the other birds *dhvānikṣa* or crow has become symbolic of a very greedy person, the type one would usually come across in a place of pilgrimage like the Paṇḍas, *tīrthakāka*, *tīrthadhvānṣa*. The buoyed up happy mind is the joyful peacock, the *manomayūra*. Coming to the insects it is the *bhramara*, the bee (the word is so frequently used in Sanskrit that it has become the source of the origination of another word for bee, the *dvirepha* the word *bhramara* having two rephas, *r* sounds in it) which steals the show. In the form of other words it (the bee), *bhṛṅga* and *cañcarika* or *kamala* in association with its favourite lotus, *abja* it is used to express total devotion, dedication *pādābjabhṛṅga*, *caraṇakamalaca -ñcarīka*; In still another word for it (the bee), *madhukara*, it is pressed into service to denote fickleness. And so goes on the list endless.

The animals, the birds, reptiles and insects have not only served to highlight the qualities of human beings, they have also served as the types to determine the rhythmic movement of their poetry. The best indicators for this are the very names of some of the metres, the *Śārdūlalalita* and the *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*, the play of a tiger, *Bhujanṅaprayāta*, the crawling of a snake, *Bhramaravilasita*, the hovering of a bee, *Gajagati*, the gait of an elephant, *Mattamayūra*, the intoxicated peacock, *Kalaharṇsa*, the swan, *Hariṇī*, the female deer, *Hariṇapluta*, the jumping of a deer.

The word is not limited to depicting excellence in human beings only. It is extended to cover even the animals. The part of the stanza quoted speaks of *gajapuṅgava*, the elephant-bull to describe the best among the species.

People in India in the very early period were conscious of

maintaining environmental hygiene. The scriptures enjoin on one not to urinate or defecate or spit in water and for maintaining social norm, not to have bath naked.

Keeping the environment clean and not to pollute it is also the message of the well-known episode of the suppression of Kaliya the Kāliyadamana. People of Mathurā had repaired to Kṛṣṇa to report to him that the serpent, the *nāga*, was polluting the Yamunā by discharging its venom into it and making it unfit for use, the *raison d'etra* of the latter in killing it. The episode signifies nothing but an attempt to save the Yamunā from pollution.

A large proportion of Sanskrit words shows its connection with animals highlighting their intimate association with their form and figure, their manners, their habitation and so on. The cow being at the centre of most of their physical and spiritual needs, the nourishing milk, yoghurt and ghee, the last one being the most important ingredient of material for a sacrifice, more words are connected with the same. A window or a ventilator is called *gavākṣa*, literally the eye of a cow, so called because of its being of that shape. The grape because of its resemblance in shape with the teats of a cow gets the name *gostanī*. For an assembly or a get-together the word is *goṣṭhī*, literally the place where the cows gather (a cow-pen), the senes getting transformation from the special to the general one of a gathering of human beings. Gomukha, a kind of musical instrument is so called because of its shape of the mouth of a cow, *goruta* is a measure of distance equal to two *krośas*, literally the sound (bleating) of a cow. Since it could be heard from a long distance, it has come to signify that distance itself.

A large corpus of *nyāyas* or illustrations in support of Śāstric principles are based on the behaviour of animals or birds like the *aviravika nyāya*, one sheep following the other blindly (even if it were merely a coincidence that the first sheep took to a particular track), *khalekapotanyāya*, the pigeons flocking to the place of the spread out of grains, *andhacaṭakanyāya* the blind man catching a sparrow, a chance or a fortuitous occurrence like the *ghuṇūksara*, the words or letters appearing on a leaf incised by the insect *ghuṇa*; *kadambagolakanyāya*, the *kadamba buds* appearing simultaneously, a simultaneous rise

or action; *kākatālīyanyāya*, a chance or an accidental occurrence as would happen if the palm fruit falls with a crow sitting on the tree and breaks the head of the wayfarer resting under it; *kākadantagaveṣanyāya*, a useless or unprofitable act like the searching after the teeth of a crow; *viṣakṣṇīnyāya*, the worms bred in poison, a state of things which though fatal to others is not so to those who are bred in it, *viṣavṛkṣanyāya* the maxim of the poisonous tree, planted by oneself not deserving of severing, used to denote the idea of not causing harm or hurt to a person, even though harmful, if one has himself brought him up and so on.

There has been so much of interaction between an Indian man and his environment that both have become intertwined with each other. The Sanskrit vocabulary is a testimony to it. It embodies the entire gamut of Indian mental make-up. Just a peep into it the present study seeks to attempt.

References

1. *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, IV. 14.
2. *Anuśaṣanaparva*, 58. 27.
3. *ibid.*, 58.31.
4. *Raghuvamśa*, II. 6.
5. *ibid.*, II. 37.
6. *Śabdakalpadruma*.
7. *ibid.*
8. A stanza well-known in Sanskrit circles. Its source however is not traceable.
9. *Mahābhārata*, Udyogaparvan, 29.25.
10. *Atharvaveda*, 19.9.14.
11. *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, IV. 12.
12. *ibid.*, VI.4.
13. *Brahmanityakarmasamuccaya*, Bombay, Śaṁvat 2034, p. 2.
14. *Bṛhadvastumālā*, Varanasi, Śaṁvat 2018, p. 40.
15. *Raghuvamśa*, VI. 65.
16. *ibid.*, III.14.
17. I.31.
18. *Śantiparvana*, 140.62.

The Date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*

The date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is still a very complicated problem nowhere nearer solution although much has been written on it. Like the dates of most of the earlier Sanskrit works there is no finality about it. Probably there can be none for, this work, as also most other similar works, do not furnish any real clue to their age. The only possible course, and the one generally adopted by researchers is to collect some internal or external data and hazard conjectures thereon. When this is done, arguments are adduced for a particular date and the opponent's views criticized. But there is no end to this process. Again others piece together some other evidence and arrive at a different date. The result is that dates differ and differ widely and the truth remains obscure. That is why an eminent scholar has said that 'all dates in Indian history are pins to be bowled all over again.' Nothing can be truer about the early history of India, whether literary or political.¹

Among the five scholars who have discussed in detail about the problem of the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* we may first mention B.L. Atreya. He thinks 'that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* cannot be placed before the middle of the 5th century A.D.'² A brief summary of his arguments in favour of this date is given below :

- i. By the time of Vidyāranya, who belongs to about the first half of the fourteenth century the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* had become an authoritative work because he quotes from it profusely, about 253 times.
- ii. Gauḍa Abhinanda, a Bengali Brahmin of the 9th century A.D. summarised the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* in 6000 verses. From this it follows that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* must be earlier than the 9th century A.D.
- iii. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a pre-śāṅkaran work, because the treatment of the Advaita philosophy here is rather

unsystematic, vague and hazy. The author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is completely ignorant of Śaṅkara and his philosophy. In his *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* Śaṅkara reproduces a number of verses and ideas from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. That he is indebted to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and not vice versa is proved by the fact that technical terms that Śaṅkara uses are not found in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*.

- iv. A comparison between the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and the *Māṇḍūkya Kārikās* of Gauḍapāda, who is earlier than Śaṅkara shows that the Advaita philosophy of the *Māṇḍūkya Kārikās* is more akin to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* than to that of Śaṅkarācārya and his successors.
- v. There is a positive evidence to the effect that the Advaita philosophy as that of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* existed before Śaṅkara and Gauḍapāda. Bhavabhūti who belongs to about the 7th century A.D. uses the term *vivarta*. He draws upon the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and incorporates a number of its verses into his works. This shows that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is earlier than the 7th century A.D.
- vi. A number of verses of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* recur in the *Vairāgya Śataka* and the *Vākyapadīya*. Now, Bhartṛhari, the author of these works is said to have died in 650 A.D. This means that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is earlier than 650 A.D. It cannot be said as to how much earlier he is.

It cannot be argued that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* has borrowed the verses from the *Vairāgya Śataka* and the *Vākyapadīya*, for the doctrine of Śabda Brahman is not mentioned in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. It is impossible to believe that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* could have omitted to mention it, if he knew it. So the verses or parts thereof which are common both to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and *Vairāgya Śataka* and the *Vākyapadīya* are borrowed by Bhartṛhari from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. Another factor that goes in favour of this stand is that the verse in which the term *vivarta* is found is rare and solitary one in the *Vākyapadīya* while in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* it forms the main doctrine and there are a very large number of verses in support of it.

- vii. The author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was acquainted with the philosophy of Buddhism, the Tathatā philosophy of Aśvaghoṣa, (who belongs to the 1st century B.C.) the Śūnyavāda of Nāgārjuna who is placed by Scholars in the 2nd century A.D. and the Vijñānavāda of Aśaṅga and Vasubandhu. Vasubandhu is believed by scholars to belong to a period between 420-500 A.D. It means the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* could not have lived before the 5th century A.D.
- viii. The way whole the theme of the *Meghadūta* is summarised in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* in three verses leaves no doubt that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a post- Kālidāsa work. The date that is usually assigned to Kālidāsa is the 5th century A.D. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, therefore, cannot be placed before the middle of the 5th century A.D. Its author probably lived at the time of the downfall of the Gupta kings. The philosophy of the work, the descriptions of battles and wars, battle between Vidūratha and Sindhu and the mention of the Hūṇas points to the same conclusion.
- ix. The conclusion drawn from the evidence cited above is that probably the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is anterior to *Bhartrhari* and posterior to Kālidāsa.

From the above summary of the points developed by B.L. Atreya in support of the date suggested by him we find that he mainly rests his arguments, apart from philosophy, on Bhartṛhari and Kālidāsa. From the *Vairāgya Śataka* and the *Vākyapadīya*, it appears that he thinks that both of these works belong to the authorship of one and the same Bhartṛhari about whom he says that he died in 650 A.D. It has now been conclusively proved that Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Śatakas* and Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Vākyapadīya* are two different persons. Itsing seems to have been misled into saying that forty years before he came to India there had died a grammarian named Bhartṛhari. Itsing confused the two Bhartṛharis. For years scholars relying upon the statement of Itsing placed Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Vākyapadīya*, in the 7th century A.D. But latest researches have convincingly shown Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Vākyapadīya* to be different from Bhartṛhari, the author of

the *Śatakas* who is said to have wavered seven times between the home and the monastery. The author of the *Vākyapadīya*, is now placed on good grounds in the 3rd century A.D.³ Now if the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, according to B.L. Atreya's own admission⁴ cannot be assigned to a period earlier than the middle of the 5th century A.D. while the *Vākyapadīya* belongs to the 3rd century A.D., it is the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* which must have borrowed from the *Vākyapadīya* and not vice versa. And the argument that the term *vivarta* occurs in a solitary verse in the *Vākyapadīya* while it occurs in a number of verses in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* proves just the other thing that the *Vākyapadīya* is earlier and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is later, because the philosophical doctrine of *vivarta* is more elaborately treated in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* than in the *Vākyapadīya* where it is merely alluded to. It is a strange argument that because in *Yogavāsiṣṭha* *vivarta* is more elaborately treated, it must be earlier. Further, to say that the doctrine of Śabda Brahman which is the main doctrine of the *Vākyapadīya* is nowhere mentioned in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is at best an *argumentum ex-silentio* and does not prove anything. The statement that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* nearly summarises in three verses the theme of the *Meghadūta* is open to correction. The three verses in question merely give us the idea of sending the cloud as messenger and do not embody a summary of the theme of the *Meghadūta*. Yet the argument has a force of its own. The idea of a cloud-messenger is generally believed to have originated with Kālidāsa; but there is nothing to show that it could not have been conceived by the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, who is highly imaginative besides being profoundly learned. The argument is, therefore, not decisive, as Atreya says it is. There is, however, a hemistich of a verse not noticed by Atreya, in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* which is the same as in the *Meghadūta* except for the first word which is *etai* in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*: *etachṛigaṃ harati pavanaḥ kiṃsvīd ity unmukhībhir dṛṣṭotsāhaś cakitacakitāṃ mugdhasiddhāṅganābhiḥ*.⁵ and *adri* in the *Meghadūta*: *adreh śṛigaṃ harati pavnaḥ kiṃsvīd ity unmukhībhir dṛṣṭotsāhaś cakitacakitāṃ mugdhasiddhāṅganābhiḥ*.⁶ This is decisive. It is 'the habit of the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, to quote P.C. Divanji, 'to borrow the language of previous works such as the Upaniṣads, *Bhagavadgīta*, *Gauḍapāda Kārikās*, *Vairāgya*

Śataka, *Meghadūta* etc., and twist it slightly so as to fit in with his idea.⁷ In keeping with this habit the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* borrows a verse from the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti and twists its language so as to spoil it a little. This verse not noticed by Atreya reads :

*kūjatkūñjakaṭhoragahvaranadikvatkāravatkīcaka
stambhāḍambaramūkamaulikulaḥ krauñcācalo 'yaṁ giriḥ.
etasmin prabalākinām pracalatām udvejitāḥ kūjitair
udvellanti purāṇarohiṇataruskandheṣu kumbhīnasāḥ.⁸*

The verse as found in the *Uttararāmacarita* reads :

*guñjatkūñjakutīrakauśikaghaṭāghūtākāravatkīcaka-
stambhāḍambaramaunamaulikulaḥ krauñcābidho 'yaṁ giriḥ.
etasmin pracalākinām pracalatām udvejitāḥ kūjitair
udvellanti purāṇarohiṇataruskandheṣu kumbhīnasāḥ.⁹*

A comparison between the verse as it is found in the *Uttararāmacarita* and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a little defective. Probably it got damaged or corrupted when it reached the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The readings in the first line of the stanza as found in the *Uttara* are certainly inferior and make little sense. It is a string of words quite unrelated in sense. What are we to understand by *kvatkāra*? Evidently it stands for *ghūtākāra*, the hooting of the owls responsible for terrifying the whole flock of crows into silence. What does *kaṭhōra* qualify? Where is hooting taking place? Certainly not in the mountain caves and the streams, etc. but in clusters of the bamboos which are said to be full of noise. *Stambha* and *prabalākinām* are perhaps scribal errors; but *krauñcācalaḥ* by the side of *giriḥ* is inexcusable. It is the writer's overfondness for a jingle at the sacrifice of sense. There must, therefore, have been a big time-lag between the *Uttararāmacarita* and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. That the *Uttararāmacarita* of the two is prior from which the verse has been taken in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, becomes pretty clear. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, therefore, cannot be placed, as Atreya has done, before Bhavabhūti, who flourished in the 7th century A.D. Again, the idea of the line which is the 4th *pāda* of verse 19 in the 115th canto of the latter half of the *Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa* is found in verse 7 of the Mandasore Stone Pillar Inscription of Yasodharman (c525-535). We may well say that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is of a date later than 535 A.D.

From the literary study of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* it becomes clear that considerable literary activity had preceded it and the author, a man of prodigious learning could not resist the temptation of incorporating into his work a line or two from earlier works which appealed to him most and which came readily to his mind to suit the context. He was not a plagiarist. His writings are characterised by originality and profundity of thought. As a poet he can stand comparison with the very best. He was a master of diction and a poet of exceptional ability but on account of these very factors efforts should not be made to place him as early as the 5th century A.D. Even later poets could be original and charming.

Uptil now too much of emphasis has been laid on philosophical and historical evidence to settle the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and literary and linguistic evidences have been completely ignored. These can be decisive sometimes for they are unimpeachable. For one thing, we find that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* poetry is characterised by excessive alliteration as also rhyme, a few examples of the latter being ;

kaṇānumuktījalatāpaṭālam tīresu sinhe sulaṭāsaṭālam
*taraṅganīrdhūtaśilograkaccham mahītalākāśam anantakaccham*¹⁰
senayor ubhayor āsīd yuddham udyatadānavam
*niṣpiṣṭanagaragrāmāgirikānanamānavam*¹¹
*āṭmaikarāmaḥ paripūrṇakāmo bhavābhayo Rāma śamābhirāmaḥ*¹²
sarva eva jagādbhāvā avicāreṇa cāravaḥ
*avidyamānasadbhāvā vicāraviśārāvaḥ*¹³

Now the use of rhyme in Sanskrit is a later development. Sten Konow is very right when he says , "Rhyme forms as essential element of versification in the poetry of the modern vernaculars and also of Prakrit but not in Sanskrit. Where rhyme occurs in Sanskrit poetry as, for instance, in that of Jayadeva, we may assume that the influence of the vernacular or of Prakrit poetry has been at work."¹⁴ It is of interest to note that Sten Konow makes these observations in connection with a work of Rājaśekhara who belongs to the 10th century A.D. Now what are the special characteristics of the work of Rājaśekhara are the special characteristics of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The obvious conclusion, therefore, to be drawn from this is that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* belongs to a period when rhyme under the

influence of Prakrit poetry had come to be accepted in Sanskrit. That period was evidently fairly late, about the second quarter of the 10th Century. The 10th century, therefore, assigned to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* by P.C. Divanji, seems nearer the truth.¹⁵ He has arrived at this date from other sources. He has not taken help of the literary evidence which would also have been very helpful. The unusual profusion of the onomatopoeic words, some 100 of which have been traced in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*¹⁶ (some of these 100 have been used as many as 30 times), a number of Prakritisms, the highly ornate poetry, specially in the second half of the *Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa*, too much of alliteration:¹⁷ all lead to this one conclusion that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a production of a fairly late period. It cannot be of the "second quarter of the 10th century A.D." as P.C. Divanji has said, although there is nothing inherently against it but because of the irreconcilability of this date with the fact of the existence of an abridgment of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, the *Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra*, by one Gauḍa Abhinanda in the 9th century A.D. P.C. Divanji, himself finds his date coming into conflict with this important piece of evidence for he himself says :

It is also clear from what has preceded that he must have done that either during the first half of the 10th century A.D. or any rate after that and that none of the arguments advanced by Dr. Atreya for the work in its present form having been composed earlier than that is likely to present any insurmountable difficulty *except that based on the existence of the abridgment of Abhinanda* (italics ours). As the evidence of its composition during or after the second half of the 10th century is so strong, the said argument cannot be given a preponderating weight and some other explanation must be sought.

This explanation he does not furnish. He concedes that he is not able to do so at present. But then how is the problem to be solved? All other mass of evidence would be of no avail for this single evidence would offset all that. It is difficult to agree with the learned scholar that it (the abridgment of Abhinanda in the 9th century A.D.) does not present any insurmountable difficulty in the way of the second half of the 10th century A.D. being accepted as the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. In the absence

of the satisfactory explanation of this important point it will be difficult to accept the date suggested by P.C. Dvanji. We cannot set the *tminus ad quem* at the second half of the 10th Century A.D. We shall have to set it at the 9th century A.D. *The work in its present form must have been in wide circulation before that date to have needed an abridgment.*

When we discuss the question of the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* it will not be out of point to mention here that there is a vast scope in a work like that for additions. With the passage of time the work must have grown and assumed the size that it now has. Apart from the six sheaths which are a later addition, according to P.C. Divanji,¹⁸ while the real *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, "is not the whole work, going today by that name, but only a portion of it extending from the 3rd Sarga of the Mumukṣu Prakaraṇa to the 213th Sarga of the latter half of the Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa", there seems to have been a good deal of interpolation in the text. The exact extent of it cannot be gauged at present for there is no critical edition of the work. Still there are some obvious things which cannot escape our notice. The use of the word *jana* in apposition with *sajjana* as in the expression *sajjanam janam* in the sense of a good person where *janam* is tautological is a recent one. The verses¹⁹ in which we come across such expressions must be later interpolations. The same may be the case with highly ornate poetry found in Cantos 115-119 in the second half of the Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa. The use of the classical metres like Śārdūlavikrīḍita, the Vasantatilakā, the Mālinī, the Drutavilambita and others, long compounds like

hemākṣhilagrāmāraṇyapurasthalīgirītarusthānvagrahārocayāḥ²⁰
vikaṭakāñcanakūṭakoṭīsaṅghaṭṭanasphuṭitajarjaracārusandhiḥ²¹

etc. the detailed poetic description of the hill-side villages and the various *Anyoktis* which have a beauty and charm all their own point to these cantos having been composed by a latter poet. Or else it will be difficult to find a satisfactory evidence for this unusual outburst of poetry in these cantos which have given us some of the finest gems of Sanskrit verses. When we say that this poetry is by a later hand we do not mean that the author of the original *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was incapable of writing such poetry. He was one of the greatest poets. But the style

here is at variance with the other parts of the work and there is such a violent break that the above conclusion would certainly be irresistible.

It is not easy to determine the date of such a work as the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* which like the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* has continuously been strengthened by extraneous matter which is so skilfully woven into the original that it is difficult to extricate it even with the help of the best scientific aids of research. The original *Yogavāsiṣṭha* must have been a much smaller text. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is said to have been composed by the sage Vālmiki. He himself appears in the dialogue between Vālmiki and Ariṣṭanemi and the dialogue between Vālmiki and Bharadvāja. It is possible, says P. C. Divanji that the same Vālmiki, who is the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa* "might have put his ideas about the true nature and essence of the wordly phenomena and the attitude which the thoughtful amongst men should adopt towards it if they have the desire to remain unaffected by the delusion which the phenomena naturally cause,"²² in a very brief form. We may agree with P. C. Divanji in that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was originally a comparatively small, compact work by a single author. But that he was Vālmiki the author of the immortal *Rāmāyaṇa* we cannot accept. Why should the great Bard stop short at a small treatise, when moved to sorrow at the killing of a *kruñca* bird by a fowler, he could give us a long poem of six or seven *kāṇḍas* of the rarest charm? Certainly the original writer must have been a much humbler person than Vālmiki. Though humbler this later writer (who chose not to disclose his identity) created a work about the beauty of which he himself was so conscious :

*śāstram subodham evedam śālaṅkāravibhūṣitam
kāvyam rasamayam cāru dṛṣṭāntaiḥ pratipāditam²³*

"This is an easily comprehensible text, a charming poem with Rasa, adorned by figures of speech and explained with examples." This verse probably furnishes the clue as to the redaction of the older text. A later writer probably found the skinny older text to be a little too dry and uninteresting and set about himself to put it in a new garb, charming and beautiful. He added illustrations to explain some of the points put forward in the original so that they may be easily comprehensible to the

common man. To highly abstruse philosophy he gave a poetic garb and in the process so changed it as to make it look really different from its basis, the small text of an ancient sage. A mightily super-structure was raised on the old foundations. Now *Yogavāsiṣṭha* did not remain a philosophical treatise, it became a *rasamaya kāvya*. The redactor whoever he may have been chose to withhold his identity like many others before him for he was not writing something new but was only putting the old thing in a new garb. How could he, therefore, give himself out as its author, although in the process of redaction he almost changed it in form, and not, of course, in content. His originality could never be questioned but such was the spirit of self-abnegation in ancient times that writers were only too silent about themselves. They effaced themselves and ascribed their works to age-old sages and saints, sages hallowed in public memory. Or perhaps there was this underlying motive that their works thus ascribed would be read more widely and preserved longer. This gave them some sort of inner satisfaction; but they did deny themselves popularity which could be theirs purely on merits. The language of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is so different that we cannot persuade ourselves to believe that the two works are of one and the same author. This is why some people think that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, if it was from the pen of Vālmīki, must have been in the form of a nucleus which served as the basis for a later writer for building upon it a work of magic drapery.

As has been said above P. C. Divanji fixed the second quarter of the 10th Century A.D. as the date of the work, when it came to have its present form and content. This conclusion he arrives at, apart from other evidences, on historical evidence, viz., the occurrence of the name of Yaśaskaravdeva in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, who had his palace in the town of Adhiṣṭhāna. On a reference to Kalhaṇa's *Chronicles of Kashmir* we find that this was the name of a Brāhmaṇa, who was made a king by a class of Brāhmaṇas which was then in power after the overthrow of Suravarman II by one Kamalavardhana in 939. This Yaśaskaradeva ruled justly till 948 A.D. and on his retirement was succeeded by his son Saṅgrāmadeva except for one day when his uncle's son Varṇata ruled there at his desire. As for

the city Adhiṣṭhāna it is mentioned in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* IV. 696. From the Introduction²⁴ to Stein's work it is found that one Pravarasena II who ruled in the second half of the sixth century founded a city Pravarapura which was also known as the Navādhṣṭhāna or the Nūtanādhṣṭhāna in Heiuntsang's time in 631 A.D. to distinguish it from the Purānādhṣṭhāna or the old city. It appears in course of time the short form of this, i.e., Adhiṣṭhāna, came in use and was referred to in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The description of this city as found in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* resembles the description of it found in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. It is stated in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*²⁵ that the city looked beautiful on account of the hills surrounding it. There was a peak of a mountain in the midst of it which was named Pradyumnaśikhara on the top of which stood a king of houses.²⁶ In the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* there is a mention of a hill named Pradyumna whose modern name is Pampar. There is a further mention of the building of two temples and a Maṭha for the Pāśupata mendicants by King Raṇāditya of Kashmir and his wife. From this it may be inferred that there may have been structures in Adhiṣṭhāna or Nūtanādhṣṭhāna, the alternate name of Pravarapura. From the identification of Yaśaskaradeva of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* with the Brāhmaṇa king of the same name of *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* and the Adhiṣṭhāna with Pravarapura, P. C. Divanji has built up a case for the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* to have flourished in any case after 949 A.D. or in the second half of the 10th Century A.D., as he could put it. He has taken great pains to secure the identification which is complete. But how will this date agree with the fact of Gauḍa Abhinanda's abridgment of it in the 9th Century A.D.? An abridgment presupposes the existence of the original. The only conclusion to be drawn from this is that the portions of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* on which P. C. Divanji builds up his theory of the second half of the 10th century A.D. do not form part of the original text. They are subsequent additions. It appears rather odd that P. C. Divanji himself says, "The second reason why I consider that these are subsequent additions in the works is that there is a distinct and unmistakable reference to a king of Kashmir of the name of Yaśaskaradeva²⁷ and yet he tries to fix up the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* on the basis of these very "subsequent additions."

The whole setting there has a modern look about it. The use of the verb in the future tense was usually the *modus operandi* of the interpolaters as would be seen from the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* and other *Purāṇas*. The explanation that Vasiṣṭha, the great sage, might have had a prophetic vision of the incidents to take place is feeble and is hardly likely to carry conviction in an age of scientific thought. P. C. Divanji cannot persuade himself to believe that the unnamed author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was living in an age prior to that of Yaśaskaradeva. The familiarity that the author shows in describing the places and persons residing in Kashmir makes Divanji believe that he (the author) must be writing this account when Yaśaskara was ruling Kashmir and Nṛsimha was his minister or when one of the successors of Yaśaskara was on the throne. Now we are in perfect agreement with Divanji so far this portion of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is concerned. Any one who composed it must have been a contemporary of Yaśaskaradeva or must have followed him not long after. But this we cannot say of the whole of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. Even after the old nucleus of Vālmīki had been put in a new garb and the new *Yogavāsiṣṭha* had emerged there was ample scope for interpolations in it. In a huge work like this there is enough scope for further additions and accretion of much foreign matter. Our contention is that *Yogavāsiṣṭha* minus later additions which may never be discovered or if discovered, will be discovered with stupendous labour, must have reached its present shape earlier than the 9th Century A.D. when Gauḍa Abhinanda thinking the volume of the work to be rather unwieldy set about to prepare an abridgment of it so that it may be more handy for the common man for whose upliftment it is meant.

Ninth Century A.D. is, therefore, the *terminus ad quem*. What is then the *terminus a quem*? Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya fixed it in the 12th Century A.D.²⁸ His principal arguments for this are:

- i. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* has a Buddhistic setting. There are certain episodes or *Ākhyānas* which deal with cycles of births much like the *Jātakas*.
- ii. The author shows favouritism for certain words like *Malita*, *Buddha*, *Bhāva*, *Śūnya*, *Cit*, *Ātman*, *Karman*, *Nirvāṇa*, etc. The rather unorthodox connotation

attached to them shows his learning towards Buddhistic tenets.

- iii. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* mentions the Pāraskīas and Tāmrayavanas²⁹ in a brief account of battle between the kings of Western India. The Pāraskīas were the people of Afghanistan who began to attack India after the 10th Century A.D. in hordes for plunder and ravage and ultimately acquired mastery. In the story as given in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, it is not said as to whether the Indian princes were overthrown or any part of India was conquered by these.
- iv. The reference to the Vedānta philosophes as the Vedāntins or the Vedāntavādins³⁰ would point out the time of the work to be after Śaṅkara.
- v. In the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* the Purāṇas are called *Bahupāthas*³¹ or having many readings or recensions. Moreover, from another text,³² it appears that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was familiar with the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. Its acceptance of the hard and the fast division between Amśakalā and Bhāgavattva of Viṣṇu is just on the line of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* which according to Pargiter³³ was a work of the 10th Century A.D.
- vi. The commentator of the work Ānanda Bodha Sarasvatī, as he himself says, was the earliest to comment on the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*.³⁴ He belongs to the 17th Century A.D.

All these facts mentioned above lead, according to Bhattacharya, to the conclusion that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* must have been written between the 10th and the 12th Centuries A.D.

The arguments put forward by Siva Prasad Bhattacharya have all been very well examined by B.L. Attreya and P.C. Divanji who believe the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* to have come to assume its present shape after the 5th Century A.D. and the second half of the 10th Century A.D. respectively.

As for the mention of the Yavanas or the Pāraskīas we know that they had begun making inroads into India much earlier than the 10th Century A.D. Moreover, the Pāraskīas were the Persians and they are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*. Their mention in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, therefore, should not be taken as a proof for the late date of the work.

Even if the work be conceded to be post-Śaṅkaran on account of the mention of the followers of the Vedānta school by the term Vedāntins or Vedāntavādins, we are nowhere nearer the period of the 10th-12th Century A.D. when the work might have been composed. This evidence only leads to the conclusion that the work is of a period later than 820 A.D. when Śaṅkarācārya is said to have died. But there is reason to infer that the work is pre-Śaṅkaran. At any rate the Vedānta philosophy did not originate with Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara only made the mass of Vedāntic theories afloat much before his time into a system. The occurrence of the term *Vivarta* in the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari which the latest modern researches have proved to be a work of the 3rd Century A.D., if not earlier³⁵ and the *Uttarrāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti, a work of the 7th Century A.D.³⁶ and the presence of the seeds of the Vedāntic thought even in as early a period as that of the Vedas³⁷ and the Upaniṣads would lead inevitably to the conclusion that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* had enough to draw upon so far as its Vedānta philosophy was concerned. "The *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, because of its palpable inconsistencies and its sweet vagueness in technology"³⁸ precludes the possibility that its author had before him a highly systematic and philosophical work of Śaṅkara. "That no writer and scholiast on Philosophy earlier than Vijñāna Bhikṣu had used it as an authority" to refute or defend a position³⁹ would only strengthen the above contention that it was a work of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* style which are compendia of all the information and, therefore, efforts should not be made to make it subsequent to any particular writer, much less Śaṅkara. "The philosophical groundwork of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a complex fabric of theories and doctrines, not very closely and systematically joined."⁴⁰

The other contention of Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* shows the influence of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, a work according to Pargiter of the 10th Century A.D., can be effectively countered as P. C. Divanji has done, by pointing out that the latest researches have fixed the date of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* much earlier. As B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma has said, "The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* was well known in the 10th Century, extant in the Seventh, not unknown in the sixth and had very likely been composed in the 5th Century A.D., if not

earlier still.”⁴¹ If the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* had been composed in the 5th Century A.D. or even earlier than that, the author’s (of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*) whose date we have fixed before the 9th Century A.D. familiarity with *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* would be very natural and would not lead to any such conclusion as the one Bhattacharya has arrived at. If the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* belongs to at least 5th century A.D. if not earlier and the date of the most of the older Purāṇas is earlier or later than this date, it would not be surprising if by the time of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* i.e., before the 9th Century A.D., they come to have many readings or recensions. The argument of the Purāṇas being called *Bahupāthas* in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is not conclusive and should not be stressed a little too much.

That the earliest commentator on the work belongs to the 17th Century A.D. is no proof positive for the late production of the work. There have been instances where works produced quite early did not have commentators until a very late date. Even in the case of the *R̥gveda* the earliest work of the mankind, the earliest wellknown commentary so far available is that of Sāyaṇa who belongs to the 14th Century A.D. Helārāja, the earliest commentator⁴² on the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari, a work, as has been stated above, of the 3rd Century A.D. or of a period earlier than that belongs to the first half of the 10th Century A.D.⁴³

The late appearance of the commentators may be an indication in the case of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, of the comparative neglect that it suffered as would be evident from the fact that “no scholiast and writer on philosophy earlier than Vijñānabhikṣu seems to use it.”⁴⁴ This neglect may be due to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*’s “Palpable inconsistencies and its sweet vagueness in technology.”⁴⁵

As for the Buddhist influence Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya himself concedes that ...“This does not help us much beyond proving that there was an admixture of Budhistic doctrines; as to time it does not take us much beyond the sixth Century A.D., even if the author be regarded as a rather late follower of the Yogācārin teacher Asaṅga.”⁴⁶

Now that all the arguments of Bhattacharya have been effectively dealt with, we cannot fix the *terminus a quem* at the

12th Century A.D. Nor can we agree with P.C. Divanji to fix it at "the fourth quarter of the 10th Century."⁴⁷ It must be fixed, as we have stated above, at the 9th Century, A.D. when an abbreviation of it by the name of the *Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra* by Gauḍa Abhinanda appeared while we are prepared to concede that additions and interpolations were carried on in the work even down to a very late period. Even allowing a period of one hundred or at the most two hundred years from the redaction of the nucleus to the appearance of its abridgement, we may say that the work might have been a product of the 8th or at the most of the 7th Century A.D. This date does not come into conflict with the fact of the "Kāvya style paraphernalia with which the work is permeated" which together with rhetorical effects and conceits" would go to show that it is a specimen of the later exuberant but extravagant Kāvya style." This extravagance or exuberance in Kāvya was as much a characteristic of the period between the 7th to 9th Century A.D. as it was that of the period between the 10th to 12th Century A.D.

V. Raghavan is the last to approach the problem of the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*.⁴⁸ He has taken great pains to controvert the theory of B. L. Atreya that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a post-Śāṅkaran work. Even if we agree on the basis of Raghavan's argument and the fact of direct attacks on Śāṅkara's doctrines in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and a pointed reference to a work in *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* to which P. C. Divanji has drawn attention in his paper,⁴⁹ we do not find ourselves in insuperable difficulty for the last date for Śāṅkara as proposed by some scholars which is 820 A.D. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* might have come to its present shape round about 850 A.D. Forty to forty five year should be a sufficient period for the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* to have become so popular with the masses as to necessitate an abridgment of it. However, there is a powerful body of opinion among scholars which believes that there have been many Śāṅkarācāryas and among them the first one, the ĀdiŚāṅkarācārya, the author of the *Bhāṣya* on the *Vedānta Sūtras* and the *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* belongs to the 1st century B.C.⁵⁰ The Śāṅkara evidence which has been pressed a little too much by some scholars does not prove anything conclusively and, therefore, not much importance needs be attached to it.

It is rather interesting that there is a mention quite a few times⁵¹ of inscriptions in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* in the form of standard of comparison, *Upamāna*. This may well lead to the surmise that the author or the redactor of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was very familiar with inscriptions and that he was living in a period when these were quite in abundance in the country. Surely the thing with which a person is more familiar generally comes to his mind when he seeks to compare one thing with the other. This fact would go against the theory of the early date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. It is in the 8th or the 9th Century A.D. that we find that India is dotted with inscriptions on stone slabs and pillars. This must have been very much in the mind of the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, when he gave it the form in which we find it today, of course even in the 5th Century A.D., the date proposed by B.L. Attreya, we have a number of inscriptions of the Guptas and the Vākātakas and before them the inscriptions of the Indo-Greeks and Indo-Bactrians and the Mauryans, yet all of them taken together do not reach the vast figures which we find in the later centuries which seems to have very much struck the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. However, there is bound to be difference on this point because apart from throwing some vague hints this does not take us anywhere nearer to the definite date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*.

The date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, therefore, must remain a problem as the date of any other Sanskrit work the author of which has unfortunately left no biographic details about himself. Arguments and counter-arguments will continue to be given in support of one view or the other, till some conclusive evidence is available. ⁵¹ As matters stands at present, we can only put forward a theory which will be one of the many in the field. The above discussion leads us to these three conclusions :—

- i. That the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a work of the first quarter of the 9th Century A.D. while in the last quarter of it there had appeared an abridgment of it.
- ii. That there was a nucleus of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* which must have been very ancient. In the 9th Century A.D. some master genius adopted it as a basis and built upon it a super-structure. It was he, the anonymous writer, who gave to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* its present form.

- iii. That the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* continued to be enriched with extraneous matter from time to time and interpolations in it continued to be made inspite of definite form which was given to it in the 9th Century A.D.

References

1. See B.L. Atreya, *The Philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha* (Section : The Probable date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭhas*), Chapter II, pp. 11-27, P.C. Divanji. *The Date and Place of Origin of the Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, Vol. 1., 1933-34, Pp. 153-170, Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya, *Proceedings of All-India Oriental conference*, Madras, Vol. III, 1924, pp. 545-554, V. Raghvan, The Date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, 1947-48, Vol. XVII.
2. *The Philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha*, Section II; p. 26.
3. Sadhu Ram, Bhartṛhari's Date, *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute*, Allahabad, Vol. IX, 1952 pp. 135-151.
4. *The Philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha*, Chapter II. But if on the ground of the mention of the cloud-messenger the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is held to have borrowed from Kālidāsa, it must also be later than Bhavabhūti for it has a number of verses common to Bhavabhūti's works. Indeed it is inconceivable that the great poet Bhavabhūti could have borrowed these verses from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and passed them on as his own.
5. VI (i). 115-19.
6. I. 14.
7. The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34; p 160.
8. VI (ii) 115.11.
9. *Uttararāmacarita*, II.29.
10. VI (ii). 117.5.
11. IV. 26.26.
12. VI (ii). 28.33.
13. II. 13.26.
Here only a few examples are given. For an exhaustive treatment of the subject, see Section III in Chapter 'Yogavāsiṣṭha — A Literary Study', of the author's forthcoming book, *Studies in the Language and the Poetry of the Yogavāsiṣṭha*."
14. *Karpuramañjarī*, Introduction, p. 505, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1963.
15. The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34, p. 166.

16. See the author's article : Onomatopoeia in the Yogavāsiṣṭha, Transactions of the Linguistic Circle of Delhi, 1968, pp. 13-28.
17. The Date and Place of Origin of *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34, p. 166.
18. *ibid.*, p. 156-57.
19. VI (ii). 1.8.25.
20. VI (ii). 115.7.
21. VI (ii) 115.41.
22. P. C. Divanji; The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-35, p. 158.
23. II. 18.33.
24. Chapter V, para 82, pp. 84-85.
25. IV. 32.11-15.
26. IV. 32.16; VI. 32.11.13.

So when we talk of the author of the work we mean by it the writer who gave the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* its present shape. For us that anonymous poet is the author.

27. The Date and place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34, p. 160.
28. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* : Its probable date and place of inception, *Proceedings of All India Oriental Conference*, Madras, Volume III. 1924. pp. 545-554.
29. III. 37.20-24, Cf. also.
30. IV. 21.26; III. 4.5; III. 13.35; III. 3.33; III. 3.40; III. 4.68; II. 2.8.9; IV. 2.29; IV. 11.63; IV. 11.20; IV. 21.39.
31. VI. 22.20-27.
32. VI. 64.31-33.
33. This statement of Bhattacharya is questionable. Pargiter merely says that the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* belongs to a period later than the 7th century A.D.
Purāṇa Texts of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, App. II, pp. 85-86, Motilal Banarasidas, 1961.
34. *Ananyapūrvavākyātaṁ grantham me vyācīkṛṣataḥ*
Introductory verses to the commentary, verse 24.
35. Vide Sadhu Ram, The Date of Bhartṛhari, *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute*, Allahabad, 1952.
36. S. K. Balvelkar, Later Life of Rama (Uttarrāmācārī) Harward Oriental Series Vol. 21, Introduction, p. XLIV.
37. Satya Vrat Shastri, Advaitavādaḥ, *Sarasvatī Suśamā*, (Journal of the Sanskrit University) Varanasi, Vol. XII, Parts 3-4, Samvat 2014.
38. Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya, The *Yogavāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*, Its probable Date and place of Inception, *Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference*, 1924, Madras, p. 549.

39. *ibid.*, p. 240.
40. *ibid.*, p. 550.
41. The Date of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Poona, Vol. XIV, Part III-IV, pp. 182-218.
42. There is no certainty about the date of the other commentator on the *Vākyapadīya*, Puṇyārāja. He may have been a pupil of Sahadeva; who might have also been Śaśāṅka-Śiṣya in Kashmir.
Now Sahadeva, the earlier known commentator on the *Kāvyālaṅkāra-sūtra-vṛtti* of Vāmana belongs to the .. Century So Puṇyārāja may also belong to that very period. Vide Charudeva Shastri, Bhartṛhari; A critical Study with special reference to the *Vākyapadīya* and its commentaries, *Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference, Lahore*, Vol. 1930, Pt. I. p. 653.
43. *ibid.* p. 652.
44. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*, The Probable Place and Date of Inception, *Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference*, Vol. III. Madras, 1924, p. 549.
45. *ibid.*, p. 549.
46. *ibid.*, p. 548.
47. The Date and place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34, last line first paragraph, p. 167.
48. The Date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, Vol. XVII, 1947-48.
49. The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*. 1933-34, p. 167.
50. V.B. Athwale, The Date of Adya Śaṅkarācārya (The First Century A.D.), by *The Poona Orientalist*, Vol. XIX, January, October, 1954, S. Srikantaya, Date of Śaṅkarācārya, *Journal of the Mythic Society of India*, Vol. XXXXVI, 1955-56.
51. III. 61.8; III. 62.16; IV. 2.20; VI (1) 46.33. VI (i) 46.36.
52. We are unable to agree with Prof. Stecherbasky "that Prof. Attreya has brought the problem (of the Date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*) very nearer to its final solution" ... *Vāsiṣṭha Darśanam*, chapter, II. p. 19.

The Plan of the Yogavāsiṣṭha

The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is divided into six chapters which are titled as Vairāgya, Mumukṣu, Utpatti, Sthiti, Upaśama and Nirvāṇa. The Nirvāṇa-prakarāṇa is the biggest of all and is divided into first half (Pūrvārdha) and latter half (Uttarārdha). According to a statement in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* itself the work contains 32000 verses,¹ but the vulgate edition of it as brought out by the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press does not contain more than 29289 verses, which are divided into various chapters in the following manner: The Vairāgya has 1146, Mumukṣu 807, Utpatti 6304, Sthiti 2414, Upaśama 4322, and Nirvāṇa 14296 verses (in the first part of this chapter there are 5331 verses, and in the latter half 8965).

In the beginning of the work the author gives his reason for composing it. It is that the sage Vālmīki composed a few Rāma-stories and taught them to his pupil Bharadvāja who, recited them to Brahmā on the mount Meru. Brahma was highly pleased with him and asked him to choose a boon. Bharadvāja asked him to show the path by which people could be freed from misery. Brahmā told him to go to Vālmīki and request him to finish the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which he had begun to write in the form of a dialogue between Rāma and Vasiṣṭha, but had not completed. By reading this people would attain true knowledge which would lead them to final absolution. Not only does Brahmā ask Bharadvāja to go to Vālmīki with this request, he himself goes to his Āśrama and requests him to complete the *Yogavāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* which had been left unfinished by him. This he should do, suggests Brahmā, so that people may be freed from misery. Vālmīki agrees and completes the work.

The introduction to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is rather interesting and in matter of style resembles the *Bhāgavata*. The story is introduced like this: A Brāhmaṇa named Sūtīkṣṇa goes to the sage Agastī and asks him which of the two paths, the path of action and the path of knowledge, would be better for one who

seeks final emancipation. Agasti replies that none of them would be better. Both would be needed just as both wings are needed for a bird for flying. Then to illustrate his point he introduces a dialogue between Agniveśya and Kāruṇya. While doing so he introduces a subsidiary dialogue between Suruci, an Apsaras, and Devadūta who tells her that he went to the sage Vālmīki with a request from his Lord Indra to explain to King Ariṣṭanemi, who was practising severe penance, the true nature of things so that he may not refuse to come to heaven. Vālmīki agreed to this request of Indra and the Devaduta took king Ariṣṭanemi to him. When the king asked him to explain the true nature of things Vālmīki recited to him the *Rāmāyaṇa* which he had composed in the form of a dialogue between Rāma and the sage Vasiṣṭha. Vālmīki's claim was that one who would listen to this *Rāmāyaṇa* would become *jīvanmukta*. King Ariṣṭanemi listened to this *Rāmāyaṇa*. In the course of the recitation of *Yogavāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* Vālmīki introduces a number of *upākhyānas* to illustrate certain philosophical principles and to make the work interesting and easily intelligible to the masses. In fact, the zeal of the author to create interest in his work is so intense that he gives his dull and drab mass of philosophy a highly poetic garb, which has a permanent appeal and charm for connoisseurs of literature. Then his work is not restricted to the *Śānta Rasa* which must predominate in a work propounding highly philosophical doctrines leading to *vairāgya*, the spirit of renunciation; by which one attains final emancipation. It introduces a number of *Rasas* to attract the people with different and varied interests. The descriptions of natural phenomena, battles and wars, floods and conflagrations are all there to keep the reader engrossed. It is these which are introduced intermittently, not to allow the interest of the reader to flag at any time.

The first two sargas of the *Vairāgya-prakaraṇa* form an introduction to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The actual dialogue between Rāma and Vasiṣṭha which begins from the third canto of the second chapter called Mumukṣu is prefaced by a description of the state of despondency of Rāma when Viśvāmitra comes to take him to the forest, his advice to him to behave like king Janaka who would perform his duty without any feeling of

attachment or sorrow and his request to Vasiṣṭha to tell him how he should behave, which he (Vasiṣṭha) complies with readily. This is the subject-matter of the work from the 3rd canto of the *Vairāgya-prakaraṇa* to the 2nd canto of the *Mumukṣu-prakaraṇa*. From the 3rd canto of the *Mumukṣu-prakaraṇa* to the 213th Canto of the Second half (*Uttarārdha*) of the *Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa* in the real *Yogavasiṣṭha*, the dialogue between Rāma and Vāsiṣṭha. From the 214th canto the story is given a finishing touch. In the 214th canto King Daśaratha, Rāma, Lakṣmana, Nārada, and Śatrughna, express their gratitude to Vasiṣṭha for the *upadeśa* and there is a description in detail as to how King Daśaratha honoured the Brāhmaṇas, fed them and worshipped them. In the 215th canto, Vālmiki winds up his dialogue with Bhāradvāja. 216th is the last canto of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and serves as the finale to the incidents with which the work is introduced. In the first two verses of this canto the dialogue between Vālmiki and Ariṣṭanemi comes to an end, the latter telling the former in verses 3-8 that his ignorance is now removed and he, therefore, is ready to go to Indra's abode. In verses 9 and 10, the Apsaras expresses her satisfaction and allows the Devadūta to go. In verses 11-12 Agniveśya winds up his talk with his son Kāruṇya, the latter informing him on a query from the former that he would henceforth behave in an unconcerned manner, neither insisting upon the performance of the rites nor avoiding them. And then comes the end. The dialogue between Agasti and Sutikṣṇa is wound up. Agasti tells Sutikṣṇa that he should not entertain a doubt about *jñānakarma* and think that actions lead to bondage after true knowledge has been attained. From verses 18-24, Sutikṣṇa expresses his gratitude to his teacher for it is on account of his grace only that he has come to know what he should.² The last two verses are in praise of Brahmā and Vasiṣṭha respectively. The work closes with the lines:

एकं नित्यं विमलमचलं सर्वधीसाक्षिभूतं
भावातीतं त्रिगुणरहितं श्रीवसिष्ठं नताः स्मः॥

The Six Sheaths

P.C. Divanji has in his inimitable way explained the six sheaths of the *Yogavasiṣṭha*-The Anna of the teaching of

Vasiṣṭha (from the 3rd sarga of the Mumukṣu-prakarāṇa to the 213th sarga of the second half of the Nirvāṇa-prakarāṇa which is the real *Yogavāsiṣṭha*) to Rāma is placed in the first sheath of a dialogue between Bhāradvaja as well as Brahmā and Vālmiki, that again in the 2nd sheath of a dialogue between Vālmiki and Ariṣṭanemi, that again in a 3rd sheath of a conversation between Vālmiki and Ariṣṭanemi, that again in a 4th sheath of a conversation between the Devadūta and Suruci, the *Apsaras*, that again in a 5th sheath of a teaching imparted by a Brāhmaṇa named Agniveśya to his son Kāruṇya, that again in a 6th sheath of a dialogue between the sage Agasti and his pupil Sutikṣṇa, and that again in a 7th sheath which is a very thin covering as it consists only of four verses by the unknown author, by the first three of which he makes obeisance to the Highest Essence and by the fourth of which he introduces the dialogue between Sutikṣṇa and Agasti. Thus there are seven layers in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* as it exists today³."

References

1. मोक्षोपायाभिधानेयं संहिता सारसंमिता।
त्रिदंष्ट्रे च सहस्राणि ज्ञाता निर्वाणदायिनी॥II. 17.6.
2. भगवंस्त्वत्प्रसादेन ज्ञातज्ञेयोऽस्मि संस्थितः। VI (ii), 216.21.
3. The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34, pp. 157-158.

Descriptive Poetry in the Yogavāsiṣṭha

The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* being a Kāvya it has beautiful descriptions in it of seasons, mountains, forests, cities and towns. It has enough of descriptive poetry in it which is characterized by deep observation and intimate touch. The descriptions in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* can compare with some of the very best in Sanskrit literature.

Of these mention may first be made of the description of the journey into space of two girl friends. The description is most vivid. Hand in hand they begin going up and up till they find themselves in space :

दूराद्दूरमभिप्लुत्य शनैरुच्चैः पदं गते।
हस्तं हस्ते समालम्ब्य यान्त्यौ ददृशतुर्नभः॥¹

And what they see then is described next. There is space like the Ekāraṇava in flood, deep and pure. It is thrilling, limpid and perspicuous :

आह्लादकमलं सौम्यं शून्यताम्भोनिमज्जनात्।
अत्यन्तशुद्धं गम्भीरं प्रसन्नमपि सज्जनात्॥²

And then the journey through space is described. How the two ladies come in and go out of the various luminaries is then mentioned. There is a little bit of mythology too. As for example, when it is said that the groups of Dākinīs dance there or that there are heaps of flesh of crows, owls and vultures or that the celestial damsels lose their ornaments as they are called to their respective heavens or that the clouds get pounded up on account of the pacing up and down of Siddhas. But apart from these flashes of mythology the descriptions have a naturalness about them and appear quite life-like. The imaginative faculty of the poet seems to be at its best in them.

At another place too the poet in the author takes the upper hand. He goes all out in simple and elegant description of a mountain which could well be the envy of any poet. Quite

peculiar to the style of the present work the description is so full of details and has such a wealth of imagery in it that it is a treat in itself. The description extends to no less than thirty seven verses in Anuṣṭubh followed by nine verses in Vasantatilakā describing the beauty of the mountain-dwellings. All these forty six verses can be cited as the best specimen of ornate classical poetry. Embellished with various figures of speech they stand out as a class in themselves. Alliteration though, a general characteristic of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* poetry, reaches perfection in them as may be seen from the following examples :

कोककोकिलकाकोलकोलाहलसमाकुलम्॥³

and

कोलाहलाकुलकुलायकुलाकुलानां
कुल्याकुलाकलकलाश्रुतसकथानाम्॥⁴

Further

विवित्रमञ्जरीपुञ्जपिञ्जराम्बुदमण्डलम्॥⁵

Also in the work is found the description of a hermitage which more or less takes after the traditional pattern. In the story as told in the second half of the *Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇā* one Kundadanta narrates the experiences of his long journeys in various countries and places. In the course of the narration he says that after he had stayed at the Gauri Temple for six months he had come to have the same old experience which he had before. He had before his eyes once again the same old hermitage of the sage (Muni). At this follows the description of the hermitage in two verses which are particularly charming and appealing.

पुष्पखण्डतरुच्छायासुप्तमुग्धमृगाभक्तः।
पणोटजाग्रविश्रान्तशुकोद्ग्राहितशास्त्रदक्॥
तद् ब्रह्मलोकसकाशमेहि मुन्याश्रमं श्रियो।
गच्छावोच्छतरं तत्र चेतः पुण्यैर्मविष्यति॥⁶

"Let us go for glory to the sage's hermitage which very much resembles the abode of Brahmā : where the innocent young ones of deer are asleep in the shady trees laden with flowers and where the parrots resting in fore-parts of the hamlets are

putting forward the Śāstric views; where the mind on account of the religious merit is likely to become purer."

The story here takes a different and altogether new turn. What happens is that Kundadanta and his companion after reaching the hermitage find it quite different from what they had visualised it earlier. They find it a desolate, barren piece of land. "No tree was to be seen there, no hamlet, no shrub, no human being. The sage was not there, not even a child, nor was there, an altar, nor a Brāhmaṇa. It was nothing but void. (In desolation) the forest appeared endless as if the hot sky had come to rest on the earth." This description of the desolation is by far the very best in the whole of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The style of the author too very well reciprocates the spirit of it. It is dynamic, emotional and racy as may be seen from the following verses :

न वृक्षं नोटजं किञ्चिन्न गुल्मं न च मानवम्।
 न मुनिं नार्भकं नान्यन्न वेदि न च वा द्विजम्॥
 केवलं शून्यमेवाति तदरण्यमनन्तकम्।
 तापोपतप्तमभितो भूमौ स्थितमिवाम्बरम्॥⁸

Another most beautiful description which is matchless in its flow of words and the opportunity that it affords for the most effective play of imagery is again found in the second half of the *Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa*. The description is that of the ocean *Ekārṇava* in flood; when the earth is submerged under the raining water and the snowfall. The water of the *Ekārṇava* gush forth in thousand torrents, carrying with them all that comes their way. There is death and destruction everywhere. The swollen *Ekārṇava* resembles a foolish master: *Ekārṇavh samcchūna āsīn mūrkhā iveśvaraḥ*. From the mountains down to withered grass roll in its big whirlpools. The billows going up in it swallow as it were the orb of the sun. The mountains Meru, Mahendra, Kailāsa, Vindhya and Sahya become its aquatic beings while elephants turning out to be as insignificant as the lotus stalks disappear in the mud of the sunken earth. The ocean is full of the moss in the form of the half burnt groves of trees. It looks as if it has been created out of the ashes of the three worlds. It is detestible on account of the mud. The Twelve Ādityas give the appearance of lotuses in it

going up as they do on the pillars in the form of the sky. The mighty clouds give the feeling of a lotus with its leaves vanished. In the vicinity of its mountains of foam there roar the mad clouds. The multitude of terrible gods and demons are carried away in it much like logs of wood. Slowly rising up it looks like licking the sun. The bubbles are being produced in it on account of the clouds roaring louder and louder; the bubbles being so big as to create the illusion of mountains. It is fully satiated on account of swallowing up of the three worlds. It is singing as it were in the form of its roarings and dancing by throwing up its treelike arms in the form of the waves which are wearing bangles in the form of the terrible mountains, (which are being washed away in it). When on account of the flooded Ekārṇava water the partial destruction of the three worlds was being wrought, there was none who could afford protection, none alas who could not be said to be under the grip of the waves. At that fateful moment there was neither the sky nor the end of the quarters. Their was neither below nor above. There was no being, no creation. Only there were waters all over. The destruction was complete. There was nothing left which could await destruction. The roaring waters had swept away everything. It was a Jalapralaya with all its havoc; with all its destruction. All that moment what could be visible to the eye was water only, water gushing forth on all sides, a vast sheet of water spreading over the earth. The climax had been reached. It was a terrible moment and at this the author was probably reminded of the famous Nāsadiya hymn in the *R̥gveda*. He altered it a bit to suit his expression. He found that it could very well serve his purpose in describing the destruction caused by the Ekārṇava in flood.

नाकाशमासीन् दिगन्त आसीदघोऽपि नासीन् तदूर्ध्वमासीत्।
भूतं न आसीन् च सर्ग आसीदासीत् परं केवलमेव वारि॥*

It is not only in the description of nature and natural phenomena that the author excels; physical features too occupy his equal attention. Thus in the narrative of Cūḍālā and Śikhidhvaja when Cūḍālā, who had earlier assumed the form of a young handsome lad Kumbha assumes the form of another lady Madanikā and marries Śikhidhvaja her would-be husband

(Śikhidhvaja) in this new form does her make up himself and praises her charming beauty in so many words; thus affording us an insight into the author's conception of feminine beauty. We may quote below the following three verses through which Śikhidhvaja describes the charming features of his would-be wife :

राजसे मृगशावाक्षि लक्ष्मीरिव नवोदिता।

पद्मकोशाङ्कुरहृदा लोलनीलोत्पलेक्षणा।

आमोदशुभङ्गङ्गारा स्वास्थिता पद्मिनीव सा॥

सुरक्तपल्लवकरा स्तनस्तबकधारिणी।

त्वमनेकफला मन्ये कामकल्पतरोर्लता॥

हिमशीतावदाताङ्गी ज्योत्स्नाप्रसरहासिनी।

पूर्णान्दुश्रीरिवोदयुक्ता हृष्टैवाह्लादयस्यलम्॥¹⁰

"O Ye with eyes like the young ones of a fawn, thou appearest like the newly grown Lakṣmī with thy heart like the sprout of the interior of the lotus. Thy eyes resemble the unsteady blue lotuses. Thou lookest like a well stationed lotus stalk with the charming humming of the bees caused by fragrance. Thy hands are red like tender leaves; thy breasts are like buds. Methinks thou art the creeper of the Tree of Cupid with a rich variety of flowers. Thy body is as white as the cold snow. Thy laughter resembllest the spread of the moonlight. With the rising beauty of the full moon thou gives me intense joy and happiness."

The treatment of the feminine beauty in the *Yogavāsishtha* will not be complete if mention is not made here of the description of the most charming beauty of a girl whom sage Vasiṣṭha (after rising from long meditation) spotted as he was looking for the very sweet sound that had first fallen into his ears. The girl was a perfect specimen of feminine beauty enhanced not inconsiderably by the peculiar and mysterious circumstances in which she was introduced. The *Yogavāsishtha* describes the beauty of the girl in the following words :

शब्ददेशपतद्दृष्टिर्दृष्टवान् वनितामहम्।

पाश्वे कनकनिष्पन्दप्रभया भासिताम्बराम्॥

लोलङ्गाम्पिल्लवलानामन्यां श्रियमिवागताम्।

वनदेवीमिवामोदिसर्वावयवसुन्दरीम्।
 सा पूर्णचन्द्रवदना पुष्पप्रकरहासिनी॥
 आकाशकोशसदना शशाङ्ककरसुन्दरी।
 मुक्ताकलापरचना कान्ता मनुसारीणी॥"

This is the description of the physical beauty of the heronie *par excellence*. Here the hero praises the heroine in words which are matchless. Earlier, however, it is the heroine Madanikā who praises the beauty of the hero, king, Śikhidhvaja, who will shortly be her husband. Her appreciation of the handsomeness and the charm of her lord is as instinctive as it is genuine as may be seen from the following examples :

राजसेऽतितरा राजन् मां करोषि स्मरातुराम्।
 रतेर्विवाहे मदनमभिभूयावतिष्ठसि॥
 इन्दोरिवांशुजालानि राजन् माल्यानि तानि तो
 मेरुगङ्गाप्रवाहाभां धत्ते हारस्तवोरसि॥
 मन्दारकुसुमप्रोतैः कुन्तलैर्नृप राजसे।
 कनकाब्जमिवाल्लोलैर्भृङ्गैः खचितकेशरः॥
 रत्नांशुजालैः कुसुमैः श्रिया स्थैर्येण तेजसा।
 रत्नस्थानं विभो मेरुमभिभूयावतिष्ठसे॥¹²

"You look very charming, O king, you make me passionate, you stand even above cupid excelling him at the time of the marriage of Rati. Those garlands of yours, O King, are really the multitudes of the rays of the moon. The necklace on your chest carries in it the beauty of the flow of the Gaṅgā from the mount Meru. O King, thou lookest handsome on account of thy tresses wherein are woven the flowers of the Mandāra tree. O Lord, thou excellest even the mount Meru, the place of origin of the pearls on account of the multitudes of the rays of the jewels, flowers, handsomeness, perseverance and majesty. Thou appearest like a golden lotus with its hovering bees smeared with pollen."

Apart from the physical beauty the description of the various qualities of the king too has its own charm. Just as in the *Raghuvamśa* and other classical poems the qualities of head and heart of the various kings are described in detail so in the *Yogavāsishtha* are they dealt with in detail. Thus the author says about Śikhidhvaja.

मालवानां पुरे श्रीमञ्छिखिध्वज इतीश्वरः।
 धैर्यौदार्यदशायुक्तः क्षमाशमदमान्वितः॥
 शूरः शूभसमाचारो मौनी गुणगणाकरः।
 आहर्ता सर्वयज्ञानां जेता सर्वधनुष्मताम्॥
 कर्ता सकलकार्यणां भर्ता पूर्ववपुर्भुवः।
 पेशलस्निग्धमधुरो विदग्धः प्रीतिसागरः॥
 सुन्दरः शान्तसुभगः प्रतापी धर्मवत्सलः।
 वेदिता विनयार्थानां दाता सकलसम्पदाम्॥
 भोक्ता सत्सङ्गसहितः स श्रोता सकलश्रुतेः।
 वेदासौ माननाशून्यः स्त्रैणं तृणवदस्पृशन्॥¹³

"There was a king named Śikhidhvaja in the capital of Mālava (Ujjayinī) who combined in him the qualities of steadfastness and liberality and had forgiveness, peaceableness and selfcontrol. He was brave, decent in conduct, reticent; a mine of various qualities. He was the performer of all sacrifices, conqueror of all archers, destroyer of all evils, protector of the earth. He was soft, affectionate and sweet and was wise; the very ocean of love. He was beautiful, peaceful and handsome. He was majestic and lover of Dharma. He would speak words which would inculcate in others *vinaya*; he was the giver of all riches. He would rejoice in the company of the good and would listen attentively to all the Śrutis. He knew everything, but was still without pride and would avoid contact with womenfolk."

At another place too we have an equally charming description of the qualities of head and heart of the hero of the story, King Janaka. We have in the work the following verses about him :

अस्त्यस्तमितसर्वापदुद्यत्सम्पदुदारधीः।
 विदेहानां महीपालो जनको नाम वीर्यवान्॥
 कल्पवृक्षोऽर्थिसार्थानां मित्राब्जानां दिवाकरः।
 माधवो बन्धुपुष्पाणां स्त्रीणां मकरकेतनः॥
 द्विजकैवशीताशुर्द्विषत्तिमिरभास्करः।
 सौर्जन्यरत्नजलधिर्भुवः विष्णुरिवास्थितः॥¹⁴

"There was brave king named Janaka, the ruler of the Videha country, whose all misfortunes had taken leave of him, who had a liberal heart due to the growing fortune, who was the desire-yielding tree for the groups of supplicants, who was the

sun for the lotuses in the form of friends, who was the spring for the flowers in the form of relatives, Cupid for women, the moon for the Kairavas in the form of Brāhmins, the sun for the removal of the darkness in the form of enemies, ocean of jewels in the form of goodness. He occupied the earth like God Viṣṇu."

It is in the story of Cūḍālā and Śikhidhvaja that we meet with a very beautiful and graphic description of the king of seasons, the spring. It is with the approach of the spring that the story gains in meaning and content. As the king had carried on his conquest of the quarters for as long as sixteen years and had fearlessly and in accordance with Dharma ruled over his subjects he experienced, as the years rolled by, the approach of the spring with all its excitements and felt a strange sensation in him, a hitherto unknown craving for the company of a consort who would brighten up his otherwise dull and drab routine. It was this yearning, this craving for a companion that ultimately led him to his marriage with Cūḍālā who added some meaning and purpose to his life. In her company he helped himself to the full from the brimful cup of youthful pleasures. The poet describes in vivid details the beauties and charms of the season which in Indian tradition has come to be known as Ṛtūrāja. The following verses which describe this season bear reproduction :

अथ गच्छत्सु वर्षेषु वसन्ते प्रोल्लसत्यलम्॥

पुष्पेषु जृम्भमाणेषु स्फुरत्सु शशिरश्मिषु।

मञ्जरीजालदोलासु विटपान्तःपुरान्तरे॥

रजःकर्पूरधवलं वलददलकपाटको।

आमोदविलसत्पुष्पगुलुच्छकवितानके॥

गायत्सु गहनेषु चैर्मिथुनेष्वलिनां मिथः।

आवाति मधुरं वायं शशिशीकरशीतले॥

कदलीकिन्दलीकच्छतलपल्लवलासिनि।

कान्तां प्रति बभूवास्य वसच्चेतः समुत्सुकम्॥¹⁵

"As the years passed by and the spring was fully on, the flowers bloomed while the rays of the moon shone forth. The mind of him (the king) which was already set on a beloved anxious for her. The gentle breeze cooled by the moon and the sprays of

waters danced on the tender leaves and the surface of the plantains. The pairs of bees sang loudly among themselves in the forests, in the swing of the intertwined bowers, in the midst of the harems formed from the twigs turned white on account of the camphor in the form of dust and having gates in the form of the turning leaves."

At another place too, there is a brief description of the Spring. It occurs in the context of the wanderings of King Janaka in the forest. As he was roaming about it—the spring season had made a visit to it most enjoyable and thoroughly rewarding—he went very far, left his followers behind and overheard the conversations of the Siddhas from behind the grove of the Tamāla trees. The following verse describes the beauty of the spring which the king noticed while moving about in the forest :

स कदाचिन्मधौ मत्ते कोकिलालापलासिनि॥

ययौ कुसुमिताभोगं सुविलासलताङ्गनम्।

लीलायोपवनं कान्तं नन्दनं वासवो यथा॥¹⁶

"Once he (King Janaka) went sportingly to a forest as Indra went to his garden Nandana in the intoxicating season of the spring where the cooing of the cuckoo was doing the dance number. The circumference of the forest was flowery; in it the damsels in the form of the creepers were engaged in dalliance."

Among the description of countries we may mention the one of Magadha which very well serves to bring out the beauty and affluence of it. We have it in the story of Dāsūra. The story opens with the description of the Magadha country :

अस्त्यस्मिन् वसुधापीठे विचित्रकुसुमदुमः।

मागधो नाम विख्यातं श्रीमाञ्जनपदोमहान्॥¹⁷

"There is a great, beautiful and well-known country on the surface of the earth, Magadha, which has trees with variegated flowers." The following three verses then describe in great details its excellence :

कदम्बवनविस्तारलीलावलितजङ्गलः।

विचित्रविहगव्यूहसर्वाश्चर्यमनाहरः।

सस्यसंकटसीमान्तः पुरोपवनमण्डितः।

कमलोत्पलकहारपूणसर्वसरितः॥

उद्यानदोलाविलसल्ललनागेयधुंधुमः।

निशोपभुक्तकुसुमनीरन्ध्रविशिखावनिः॥¹⁸

“Which was surrounding the forest as it were by its expanse of the Kadamba groves, which was captivating on account of all the wonders and flocks of strange birds; the bordering regions of which were full of grains adorned with cities and gardens; the banks of all the rivers of which were full of lotuses, the *utpalas* and the *kalhāras*; which was humming with the songs of the ladies sporting in the garden swings; wherein the earth had no space left on it on account of the arrows in the form of the flowers used in the night (by lovers).”

It is a beautiful description of the natural beauty and as well as the prosperity of the country. The country had a surplus in food with all-round plenty. What else could the people do except to lead a life of pleasure?

References

1. III. 24.1
2. III. 24.3.
3. III. 28.53.
4. III. 28.62.
5. III. 28.19.
6. VI (ii) 181.14-15.
7. VI.(ii) 181.18-19.
8. VI (ii). 78.28.
9. VI (i) 106.47.
10. VI (i) 106.49-51.
11. VI (ii) 60.3-7.
12. VI (i). 106.39-42.
13. VI (i). 77. 12-16.
14. V. 8.1-3.
15. VI (i) 77.19-23.
16. V. 8.4-5.
17. IV. 48-9.
18. IV. 48.10-12.

The Anyoktis in the Vogavāsiṣṭha

Of the figures of speech *Anyokti* is one of which some of the most interesting examples are to be met with in the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*. *Anyokti* is an indirect way of saying things which is nevertheless effective. There are occasions when we do not want to say something directly to a person. It may be discourteous, may wound his vanity, may provoke his anger and embitter our relations with him. Similarly if some pleasant references are made to a person at his very face it may tantamount to a crude form of sycophancy. To avoid this, a resort is made to the poetical device called *Anyokti*. Here some other thing, may-be a bird, a tree or for that matter any kind of natural phenomenon is employed as a medium through which the poet expresses his feelings. It is not this some other thing directly addressed and spoken of that is meant. It is another person who is in reality addressed and sought to be described. The oblique way of saying things has been very popular with Sanskrit poets. Sanskrit literature abounds in some of the finest *Anyoktis* which for their charm and appeal remain unrivalled. The *Anyoktis* of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha have become a household word in the Sanskrit world. Since ages the *Anyokti* form of poetry has caught the imagination of the people and the poets have been taking special delight in it. They have been taking to this form of writing even for the purpose of developing a point or enunciating a principle. It is for this purpose that a large number of *Anyoktis* have been written in Sanskrit. There are quite a good number of them written for another purpose too, viz., for praising the kings or patrons and for deriding them. In the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* it is the latter variety of *Anyoktis* which is generally met with. There are, especially in the second half of the *Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa*, some of the finest *Anyoktis*, a few dealing with cuckoos, crows and other birds, and a few others

dealing with miscellaneous things. Some of the finest examples of the *Ānyoktis* in the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* are given below :

*kiṁ kiṁ kokila kūjasi drutravaṁ harṣāt samullāsitaṁ
grīvākoṭarataḥ praveśaya punar mā bhūc ciraṁ te bhramaḥ |
uddāmaḥ kusumair nirantaratarāṁ nedaṁ madhor jṛmbhitāṁ
hemantena kṛtās tuṣāranikaraiḥ śuṣkā amī pādapāḥ ||'*

"O cuckoo, why are you crying aloud with joy? Your cooings you should withdraw to the cavity of your throat. Do not be under an illusion for long. This is not the advent of the spring season which is characterized by the thickness of the wildly growing flowers. These trees have been made dry by winter by its masses of snow."

In the above example a cuckoo is asked to stop its cooings for it is winter and not spring. The implication here is that there is a time and a place even for the sweetest expressions, such as the warbling of a cuckoo and that one should not go on telling the non-receptive audience of one's qualities and attainments etc. in a moment of excitement. When the people around are in no mood to listen or are otherwise not interested, one should better keep quiet and not waste one's breath; for words uttered inopportunely may not only be tasteless, but also distasteful. The same idea has been expressed in the following very interesting *Anyokti* :

*bhrātāḥ kokila kūjitair alam alaṁ nāyāty anarghyo guṇas
tūṣṇīm āssva viśrṇaparnapaṭalacchanne kvacit koṭare |
uddāmadrumakandare kaṭuraṭkākāvalīsamkulaḥ
kālo' yaṁ śīśirasya samprati sakhe nāyam vasantotsavaḥ ||'*

"O brother cuckoo ! stop your cooing. (For) hereby you do not acquire a precious quality. Keep mum (lying) some where in a hollow (of a tree) covered with a layer of withered leaves, in the recesses of the lofty trees. O friend, this is not the festival of spring. It is the time of winter, full of rows of crows producing jarring notes."

In the following verse too, the poet gives us an equally charming and interesting *Anyokti*. The idea that he wants to convey is that when a person is seen to be promising, many come forward to claim him for themselves. It is this clamour for owning him that presents the most disgusting sight. This

idea is put by the poet in the form of the *Anyokti*. A young one of a cuckoo, as soon as it tries to win the hearts of others by its sweet notes, is claimed as its off-spring by a crow which makes a sudden appearance in a pleasure-grove where the audience which had begun to enjoy the sweet notes of the cuckoo, feels perturbed and disappointed. The verse which presents this *Anyokti* runs thus :-

*vācā komalayā sukokilaśiṣuḥ kalyāṇakalpāṁ kathāṁ
sarvāvarjanam ārjavena kurute yāvat puro rāgiṇām ।
tāvaṁ mattanayo 'yam ity avirataṁ drāṅkārabhūmaravair
dhvāṅkṣeṇopavane nipatya nabhasaḥ sarve kṛtā mīrasāhī**

“As soon as the young one of a cuckoo with its tender notes makes in all its innocence a blissful utterance captivating one and all in the presence of music-loving, anxious audience, there appears from the sky quite suddenly a crow which with its ceaseless harsh cries claims it to be its own off-spring. At this every body present in the garden feels upset and sad.”

Another verse where a cuckoo is used as the medium of the *Anyokti* is as follows :

*śrotrotsavam tava kalam kalakaṇṭha ko'tra
nādam śṛṇoti iti vigrahasandhidūtam ।
kākair ulūkakalahair iha gulmakeṣu
kreṅkāragharghararavaiḥ śrutir āgatāstam ।**

“O sweet-throated cuckoo ! who is there to listen to your sweet notes, the feast to the ears, the harbinger of peace in love quarrels? Here in these shrubs the ears have become deafened by the fights among crows and owls.”

The idea in the above example is that the din and turmoil that is raised by the petty people is responsible many a time for turning the people's minds away from the finer things of life. The author of the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* has been able to give expression to this idea most effectively. It could not have been better expressed.

Of the *Anyoktis* where a crow is employed as the medium for propounding some truth, mention may here be made of the two which are found in the canto one hundred and sixteenth of the second half of the sixth book which has preserved for us a

few of the finest *Anyoktis* of the Sanskrit literature. One such we have where a crow is said to cause headache to a person by drowning the humming of the bees by its harsh cries. The verse purports to convey the idea that a loud noise very often drowns sweet words of reason. A wise man may not be able to create a loud noise. In his soft accents he may say some words of profound wisdom which may go unheard, drowned by the thunders of the fools. This is really the most distressing sight. A sensible man cannot but feel sorry for this state of affairs in society where those who speak the loudest come to hold the stage while the others, profoundly learned and immensely wise are elbowed out. Nobody listens to them or rather, nobody is allowed to listen to them. The verse where this interesting *Anyokti* is found is :

*kākaka kaṭukalkārava
kavalitaḡaṇa kardame bhraman sarasi ।
antarayasi madhuparavaṇi
yad ato me śirasi phalabhūtaḡ ॥ 5*

“O you wretch of a crow! since you have swallowed up the virtues (of the swan and others) with your harsh worthless cries, and since you drown the humming of the bees (by your loud noise), while moving about in the mud of a pond, you are a source of headache to me.”

The second one is where an interesting question is put to a crow. We see that a crow is by nature very suspicious. It does not tolerate its share being taken by birds other than those of its own species. But when it comes to the young one of a cuckoo all its cleverness departs and it begins to rear it as its own offspring. This makes it a butt of ridicule. The idea is that you may be very discreet about things in general but when it comes to a thing which you are fond of, for which you have a passion, all your reason may forsake you. Love of offspring is a passion common to all life. This *Anyokti* is found in the following verse:

*he kāka karkaśarava krakacaikacihna
tādyk svaśaṅkanam api kva nu te' dya yātam ।
kasmād anarthakam idaṇi pikapākam eka-
putrāśayā tad api te hy upahāsasiddhyai ॥ 6*

“O you crow! you caw harshly and share the distinctive nature of a saw (you are as sharp as saw). Where has gone today to that apprehensiveness of yours that you are bringing up uselessly this young one of a cuckoo in the hope of obtaining only one off-spring, which Nature has vouchsafed to you, you being *ekaputra* or *sakṛtpraja*. This makes you a fit object for ridicule.

Of the *Anyoktis* having a cloud as the medium, mention may be made here of the two which are so interesting and remarkable that they can stand comparison with some of the very best of their kind in the whole of the Sanskrit literature. One of them is:

*śrīmadvṛtta mahāśayātapahara proccair gabhūrākṛte bhūbhṛ-
nmūrdhasu bhūṣaṇaṁ bhavasi bho bhūme rasaikāspadam ।
etat tu kṣapayen manāṁsi yad idaṁ megha tvayā varṣatā
harṣād ūśarapaḥvalasthalataruṣv ambhovibhāgakramaḥ ॥ 7*

“O cloud! you are an ornament on the heads of the mountains. You are source of water on the earth. You have a brilliant conduct. You are magnanimous. You remove the heat. Your appearance is very solemn. But (inspite of all these qualities) this will cause pain to the minds of the people that when in your joy you send showers, you divide your waters equally between fallow lands, ponds and land trees.”

In other words in the grab of a cloud a person is reproached here who, while giving does not make distinction between the deserving and the undeserving. If a person like a cloud which pours its waters at a place where they are not wanted and go waste, gives liberally without giving due thought to the qualities and the requirements of the person who receives the gift, cannot earn a good name. His charity may be misused by the unscrupulous and in that case the donor cannot escape the blame, however, well-meaning he may be. While doing a good turn pick-and-choose is what is really necessary. When there is such pick-and-choose then the good work done by the donor will earn him the appreciation of all and the possibility of a good thing leading to evil results would also be obviated. The second is:

*nityam snāsi sūtirthavārivisarair uccaiḥ padastho 'mbuda
śuddhaḥ san vipināvanau nivasasi prārabdhamaunavrataḥ ।
riktasyā py atikāntir eva bhavataḥ kāyāśrayā lakṣyate
prothāyāśanim ātanoṣi kim idam tuccaṁ tavāceṣṭitam ॥**

“O cloud! you always take bath in the expansive waters of the holy places sitting high up. Thus purified, you undertake a vow of silence and live in forest lands. Even when you are emptied of your contents, your body appears very lustrous. (But) what is this mean act of yours that you get up and produce (smashing) lightning and thunder (thundering noise)?”

In the above verse in the garb of the cloud somebody is reproached for inconsistency in, and impropriety of conduct and that is what makes it an *Anyokti*. A person may be virtuous, pure, self-restrained and generous. His conduct should consist of these virtues. When generous, he should be sweet as well. He should not preface his act of making gifts with harsh words for the recipients. These will humiliate them and will take the grace out of his charity. As a matter of fact, the works on social ethics point out that while giving something in a charity one should not be actuated even by an element of pity for the supplicant. Even that is considered undesirable, but if, in addition to this, one were to use harsh words, that would certainly be uncharitable.

Another verse which employs a crow for an *Anyokti* is as follows :

*ālokya pañkajavane savilāsavantam
kākaṁ kalañkasadrśam bhṛṣam āraṇtam ।
hā kaṣṭaśabdaśatanaṣṭaviceṣṭito yo
no roditi krakacakena vidāryatām saḥ ॥ **

“Seeing a crow looking like a dark spot, sporting in a lotus-bed and continuously crying, a person who, though rendered inactive by hundreds of the jarring notes does not weep, let him be torn asunder by a saw.”

The implication of the *Ānyokti* in above verse is that the sight of a mean and ignoble person occupying a place, which in the fitness of things belongs to the noble, and acting disgustfully should sadden and distress any sensible person. A

person who remains unmoved, deserves all contempt and condemnation.

There are a few beautiful and charming *Ānyoktis* of *Ākāśa* or the sky in the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*. In one of these the sky, though possessing all good qualities is said to have one bad thing about it, which is, that it sheds burning heat. The idea is that a person should be good-natured, amiable and sweet apart from his being possessed of many other qualities and merits. But if he is not amiable and flies into rage, thereby creating unnecessary heat, all his other qualities will be of no avail. The absence of this one quality is enough to lower him in public estimation. This interesting *Ānyokti* is found in the following verse:

*kalpābhradrumavīrudunnatidṛśāṁ kartāsi dhartāsi ca
ākāśendughārkakinnaramarutskandhāmarāṇām api ।
sarvaṁ ramyam asaṅkulāśaya samasvacchasvabhāvasya te
yat tv etad dahanatvam aṅga tad aho mukhyāya khedāya naḥ*

॥¹⁰

“O sky! you lead to the growth of trees, creepers and bring forth clouds at the time of universal destruction and you sustain the moon, the sun, the *Kinnaras*, the *Marut-Skandhas* and the gods. O magnanimous one, of you who have even and clean nature everything else is charming, but that you shed burning heat is the cause of our great torment.”

We have another equally beautiful *Ānyokti* of the sky. The sky and through that medium some other thing also is the object of censure here. The sky merits censure, for it allows a cloud to rest on it and sends down a shower of hail for pounding people below, implying that, however, high and noble a person may be, he should not allow others, who may use his patronage for oppressing the people, to surround him. They will bring him a bad name. These underlings very often prove the greatest drags on the reputation and the prestige of the highly placed persons who may have personally nothing reproachable about them. It is not an uncommon sight in this world to see the petty officials of the village and district levels working under the protective shadows of their superiors or the provincial government bringing disrepute to the entire administrative machinery by

their oppressive acts and third-degree methods. That these small fry are allowed protection by the superiors proves the greatest weakness of them. Such a beautiful all-time truth is enunciated by the author of the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* in the following verse :

*ākāśa kāśam asi nirmalam accham uccair-
ādhāra unnatayatottamam uttamānām
tvām etya kin tu viralaṁ karakāghano 'yaṁ
lokaṁ vimardayati tena paro 'si nīcail ॥*

“O sky ! you are shining, pure and clean. On account of your loftiness you are the substratum of the best. But you are the meanest of all too, because considering that you have a space, a hail-showering cloud resorts to you and pounds the people (by a shower of hail).

Yet another similarly interesting *Anyokti* is found in the verse :

*ākāśa karṣakaśa eva nikarṣaṇaṁ te
manye ciraṁ samucitaṁ na tu kiñcid anyat ।
śūnyo 'si yaj jaladhararkṣavimānacandra-
sūryānilān vahaṣi bhāsi na cārthaśūnyaḥ ॥*

“O sky! I think, what is proper for you is that you should be rubbed for quite sometime on the touch-stone and nothing else, for even though a void you carry on you the clouds, the stars, the aerial cars, the moon, the sun and the air and thus appear not to be a void.”

The poet means to say that the nature of things and persons is sometimes difficult to ascertain. Particularly the nature of the great is inscrutable. It is undefinable, for it is tinctured by inconsistencies, by the opposites which go ill together. Apparently stern, a great person may be really gentle; apparently callous, he may be full of the milk of human kindness; apparently short-sighted, he may be really far-sighted, seeing things beyond the ken of ordinary mortals. Surely his nature is a complex which defies analysis and baffles comprehension. Truly has the poet Bhavabhūti observed :

*vajrād api kaṭhorāṇi mṛdūni kusumād api ।
lokottarāṇāṁ cetāṁsi ko nu vijñātum arhati ॥³*

“Who can understand the heart of the great people which is atonce harder than a thunderbolt and softer than a flower?”

It is in this context that the authors of the *Dharmasūtras* declare : *na devacaritaṃ caret*.

After this we have in the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* an interesting *Ānyokti* where the sky is said to assume a number of forms and by so doing suggests a clever person whose ways are rather unpredictable. Even the wise will not be able to predict his movements. His mind will run in devious ways. He will adopt different postures in different places. What his real self is nobody will ever be able to find out. His character and conduct will always remain an enigma, however, closely and minutely he may be watched. This fundamental truth is expressed in the *Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* in the following verse :

*ahni prakāśam asi raktavapur dinānte
yāmāsu kṛṣṇam atha cākhilavasturiktam ।
nityaṃ na kiñcid api sad vahasīti māyāṃ
na vyoma veti viduṣo ' pi viceṣṭitaṃ te ॥¹⁴*

“You are resplendent by day, assume a red form in the evening, are dark and empty, (as it were) of all things at night. Although you are ever nothing, you always carry (the stars, the moon etc.) on you. O sky, even though you are wise nobody knows your clever movements.”

Apart from the *Anyoktis* cited above there are many others which are no less interesting and charming. As a matter of fact, nearly the whole of the one hundred and sixteenth canto of the sixth book is replete with verses which approximate in character to the *Ānyokti*. This very well helps bring out the author's love for *Anyoktis* in which he is seen to be in his top-form. The language and the style of the *Anyokti* verses is simply excellent and is a pattern for the later age when poets like Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha enriched the Sanskrit literature with their *Anyoktis* some of which have passed into common use.

References

1. vi (ii), 116.77.
2. vi (ii), 215.80.

3. vi (vi). 116.76
4. vi (ii) 116.75
5. vi. (ii). 116.63.
6. vi (ii). 116.70
7. 2. vi. (ii) 116.50.
8. vi (ii). 186.51.
9. V (ii) 116.71
10. VI. (ii) 116.114.
11. VI. (ii) 116.15.
12. VI (ii) 116.16
13. *Uttararāmacaritam*, II.7.
14. VI (ii) 116.17:

Contribution of the Muslims to Sanskrit in Medieval Period

पूर्वपीठिका

शुक्लाम्बरधरां शुक्लां वीणापुस्तकधारिणीम्।
भवतक्षेमङ्करां नित्यं वाग्देवीं प्रणमाम्यहम्॥1॥

दिष्ट्या विलसति पुरतः परिषदिहाभिरूपभूयिष्ठा।
अध्यक्षतामथास्या निर्वहन्ति भारतदेशस्य राष्ट्रपतयः॥2॥

नानारत्नसमृद्धा या दिव्या गीर्वाणभारती।
कृतो यत्नो महास्तत्र यवनैरप्यसंशयम्॥3॥

प्रसूनराशावुपलभ्यमानं मरन्दमास्वादयितुं समुक्ता।
स्वस्यावशा चेत्समुपैति भृङ्गराजिर्विचित्रं किमिवास्ति तत्र॥4॥

इस्तामधर्मं स्थितिभागिनोऽपि नैके विपश्चित्प्रवराः प्रमोदात्।
गीर्वाणवाणीपरिशीलनेन तद्वाङ्मयं वृद्धियुतं वितेनुः॥5॥

वृत्तस्य तेषामतिविस्तृतस्य निवेदनायैव निमन्त्रितोऽहम्।
विद्वद्वराणां भवतां पुरस्ताद् वाचं मदीयां समुदीरयामि॥6॥

तां "सन्तः श्रोतुमर्हन्ति सदसद्व्यक्तिहेतवः।
हेम्नः संलक्ष्यते ह्यग्नौ विशुद्धिः श्यामिकाऽपि वा"॥7॥

His Excellency the President of India, Padma Bhushan Shri
Suraj Bhan, Professor Veda Vyasa, Shri M.Nath, Colleagues
and friends.

I have great pleasure in speaking to you this evening on
the contribution of Muslims to Sanskrit. That pleasure becomes
doubled with the presence among us of our respected
Rashtrapati. With his permission I start my lecture.

One of the oldest languages of the world Sanskrit has grown
and developed in India over the past thousands of years. Its
literature consists of some of the finest specimens of human
creation. It has been enriched by people of different cultural
and ethnic groups, different religious and social backgrounds,
different linguistic and speech habits. It is Indian in the true

sense of the term, not possible to be associated with any particular community or group of people. Still in popular notion it has come to be associated with the Hindus just as Persian and Urdu have come to be associated with the Muslims. It is to remove this erroneous notion, arisen in all probability from lack of adequate information, that the present exercise is being undertaken.

It may in passing be pointed out here that there is a basic difference between the condition of Sanskrit and that of Persian/Urdu. The latter have been after the introduction of Islam in India for almost a thousand years the languages of the Muslim rulers enjoying the privilege of being the languages of State. If the Hindus took to them they did so in all probability for gaining an access to the ruling class with all its attendant advantages. Again, these two languages, Persian and Urdu, were spoken at least by an important section. There was no such outward advantage with Sanskrit. If in spite of this non-Hindus, the Muslims in particular, patronized it, studied it and interpreted its vast literary wealth, they did so for the mere love of it. They were probably so deeply impressed with its charm, its sweetness, its rhythm and its richness that they thought to drink deep at its fountain-head, either directly or through translations.

It has been the special characteristic of the country that two parallel planes have continued to exist in it side by side. While on the actual plane it has accepted distinctions of caste and creed, on the intellectual plane it has discarded them, resulting in its development, in spite of a multiplicity of castes and creeds in it, as a haven of peaceful co-existence. There has as a consequence been a good deal of give and take between castes and castes and communities and communities. The quest of knowledge for the realization of the Supreme has been common to all the inhabitants of this ancient land. Any pious person or a spiritual leader would find adherents in it from all communities, Hindus, Muslims and Christians. It was in this country that Andal, a woman of low caste could win the veneration of the Alvars in the South. It was in this country again that the work of Pariahs like Thirupam could secure recognition from such stalwarts as Rāmānuja. The religious leaders who influenced

large sections of society in their times like Caitanya of Bengal, Śaṅkaradeva of Assam, Tukārām of Maharashtra, Nānak of Punjab, to mention only a few, did not believe in the distinctions of caste and community and had among their adherents both Hindus and Muslims. As a more telling instance of this could be mentioned Rāmānanda who had Ravidāsa a shoe-maker, Kabir a Mohammedan weaver and Senā, a barber, among his disciples. Communal harmony was therefore ingrained in the very thinking of the country which had evolved itself along higher paths over the centuries. That is why the two principal communities in it, though maintaining their separate identity and following their separate religious practices have achieved a kind of fusion that defies all description. Hindus visit Muslim saints and their Dargāhas and offer prayers. The Muslim saints Saiyad Ali-al Hujwiri is as much honoured by the Muslims as the Hindus. The same can be said of the disciples of Muinuddin Chishti and many others. It is again because of this that the Hussaini Brahmins of Rajasthan are found following Mohammedan practices, though adhering at the same time to Hindu rituals and customs. It is again due to this that the Imam Shahi sect of the Muslims is seen following the authority of the *Atharvaveda* and of Nīṣkalaṅka. And it is due to this again that most of the Sufi saints like Nizamuddin Aulia, Fariduddin Shakarganj, Shah Inayat Shah Kalandar, were initiated by Hindu spiritual leaders.

With such give and take among the Hindus and Muslims it was but natural for them to feel attracted towards the languages and the literatures of each other.

In the medieval period arts and letters flourished under the patronage of rulers. If royal or official patronage had not been available to Sanskrit it would not have flourished to the extent it did. Many of the rulers of the period, especially the Mughals, and some of the high officials working under them extended their patronage to it. Of the Sanskrit writers patronized by them could be mentioned Bhānukara, Akabariya Kālidāsa, Puṇḍarika Viṭṭhala, Gaṅgādhara, Kṛṣṇa, Rudrakavi, Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja, Vedāṅgarāya, Amṛtadatta, Harinārāyaṇa miśra, Vamśīdhara, Lakṣmīpati and so on.

Bhānukara or Bhānudatta enjoyed the patronage of emperor Sher Shah whom he eulogizes in one of his verses.

He also eulogizes Nizam Shah, identified with Burhan Shah of the Nizam Shahi dynasty who ruled from 1510-1515 A.D. He was the author of eight works two of which are commentaries on his own writings.

One of the greatest of the poets of the 16th Century A.D. Akabariya Kālidāsa, as his very name shows, was indebted to Akbar for his patronage to him, which had probably prompted him to go in for this peculiar name which was his pseudonym, his original name being Govindabhaṭṭa. In his quite a few verses preserved in the anthologies he speaks of a number of kings of his time such as Rāmacandra of Rewa, who sent Tansen to Akbar's court, a king of Gurjara, Gurjarendra, King Jallala, a Vaghela king and one Dalapati.

Emperor Akbar was a great lover of literature and a number of Sanskrit poets, scholars and men of letters enjoyed his patronage. Bhānucandra and his disciple Siddhacandra wrote an exhaustive commentary on the *Kādambarī*. Bhānucandra, as he himself says in the prefatory verses, was Akbar's favourite : अकब्बरक्षमापतिदत्तमानः।

Rāmacandra wrote *Rāmavindoda* an astronomical work in Sanskrit for Rāmadāsa Bhūpāla, a minister of Akbar which gives his (Akbar's) full genealogy. His brother Nilakaṇṭha wrote *Toḍarānanda* a work on Civil Law, Astronomy and Medicine for Todarmal, one of Akbar's ministers.

Behari Krishna Das wrote a work *Pārasīprakāśa* which, as the author himself states, was composed for the pleasure of Akbar : अकबरनृपरुच्यर्थम्, so were composed the work *Nītisāra* and *Nartananirṇaya* on music, dancing and so on by Gaṅgādhara and Puṇḍarika Viṭṭhala respectively.

As was Akbar so were his son Jehangir and grandson Shah Jehan. In the former's reign a scholar Śrīkṛṣṇa in whom he placed great confidence wrote *Bījanavāṅkura*, a commentary on Bhāskarācārya's Algebra and a poet Rudra Kavi wrote three works, the *Kirtisamullāsa*, and the *Dānāśāh Carita* on emperor Jehangir, on the emperor's son prince Khurram and Akbar's son prince Danyal. In the latter's reign there flourished a number

of Sanskrit poets and scholars, the most prominent of them being Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha who wrote a number of works like the *Rasagaṅgādhara*, the *Bhāminīvilāsa*, the *Gaṅgālaharī* and so on and who spent quite a few of his earlier years under his benevolent patronage : दिल्लीवल्लभपाणिपल्लवतले नीतं वयः, having been invited to his court when his fame had spread with the defeat by him of a Jaipurian Kazi at the disquisition concerning Islam. In a verse ascribed to him he praises the munificence of the lord of Delhi or the emperor. According to him it is either the lord of Delhi or the Lord of the universe who can fulfil people's desires :

दिल्लीश्वरो वा जगदीश्वरो वा मनोरथान् पूरयितुं समर्थः।

Of the gifts by other kings, he says : (They are too tiny), they can procure for us a vegetable or a pinch of salt in a meal :

अन्यैर्नृपालैः परिदीयमानं शाकाय वा स्याल्लवणाय वा स्यात्।

According to a tradition he married a Muslim girl, Lavaṅgī. He enjoyed Shah Jehan's patronage in full. It was he who conferred on him the title of पण्डितराज for his *Āsafavilāsa*, a work written by him in praise of Nawab Asaf Khan, brother of Nur Jehan and the minister of Shah Jehan : सार्वभौमश्रीशाहजहाङ्गसादाधिगतपण्डितराजपदवीविराजितेन... He is said to have left Delhi after the death of Dara Shikoh whom he greatly admired for his learning.

Among other writers of Shah Jehan's reign mention may be made of Munīśvara who wrote the *Siddhāntasārvabhauma* also called *Siddhāntatattvārtha*, a versified compendium of theoretical astronomy, *Nirṣṭārthadūtī*, a commentary on the well-known mathematical work the *Līlāvātī* and *Marīci*, a commentary on the *Gaṇitādhyāya* and the *Golādhyāya* of Bhāskara's *Siddhāntaśiromaṇi* besides a small work, the *Pāṭisāra*, Bhagavatisvāmin who wrote *Kāvyaavṛttiprabhoda* a treatise on metres used in Kāvya, Nityānanda who wrote two works on astronomy the *Sarvasiddhāntarāja* and *Siddhāntasindhu*, the latter at the instance of Asaf Khan, the minister of Shah Jehan : सोऽयं वासफखां विभाति सकलान् वर्णाश्रमान् पालयन् तस्य प्रेरणया, Vedāṅgarāya who wrote a number of astronomical and religious treatises, the more prominent of them being the *Pārasiprakāśa*, dealing with the methods of conversion of the

Hindu dates into Mohammedan and vice versa and Arabic and Persian names of the week, the months, the plants, the constellations and so on, which he wrote to please the emperor and gain his favour :

श्रीमच्छाहजहानहेन्द्रपरमप्रोतिप्रसादाप्तये

Harinārāyaṇa Miśra no work of whom has come down to us except the two verses in the anthologies in one of which he praises his patron, the emperor Shah Jehan. It is interesting to note that it was not only the emperor who patronised Sanskrit scholars, his queen Mumtaz Mahal too did the same. Varṇśīdhara Miśra, a Sanskrit poet of note, enjoyed her patronage. The anthology, the *Padyāmṛtatarangiṇī* records a verse by him. There appears to have been a rivalry between the two great contemporaries Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha who enjoyed the favour of the emperor and Varṇśīdhara Miśra who enjoyed the favour of the queen. The said anthology has a verse by the Paṇḍitarāja too. Both the poets through a verse each are interpreted to have a dig at each other.

The Paṇḍitarāja says that he does not find an elephant anywhere near him, not to speak of a lion, on whom he could show his prowess :

दिगन्ते श्रूयन्ते मदमलिनगण्डाः करटिनः
करिण्यः कारुण्यास्पदमसमशीलाः खलु मृगाः।
इदानीं लोकेऽस्मिन्ननुपमशिखानां पुनरयं
नखानां पाण्डित्यं प्रकटयतु कस्मिन् मृगपतिः॥

Varṇśīdhara Miśra says that the favourite of Mahādeva (oblique reference to Shah Jehan) is a bull. The favourite of Durgā (oblique reference to Mumtaz Mahal) is a lion. Since it enjoys Her favour (meaning that since he enjoys Mumtaz's favour) it does not find any body to test its prowess; not even the Śiva's bull, (meaning Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha who enjoys Shah Jehan's favour, Śiva being taken as symbolic of him) for that is a bull after all :

दिङ्नागाः प्रतिपेदिरे प्रथमतो जात्यैव जेतव्यतां
सम्भाव्यस्फुटविक्रमोऽथ वृषभो गौरैव गौरीपतेः।
विक्रान्तोर्निकषं करोतु कतमं नाम त्रिलोकीतले
कण्ठकालकुटुम्बिनीकरुणया सिक्तः स कण्ठीरेवः॥

Not only the Mughals, other Muslim rulers or noblemen or officers too extended patronage to Sanskrit scholars and writers of their time.

King Shahabuddin, in all probability a ruler of Kashmir, had in Amṛtadatta a court poet in Sanskrit who recorded the fact of the despatch of a message by him (Shahabuddin) to one Mir asking him to desist from invading Kashmir.

King Burhan Shah of the Faruqi dynasty which ruled between 1320-1600 A.D. at Anandavalli at Khandesh had in Puṇḍarika Viṭṭhala, a writer of repute, who concentrated on writing on music in Sanskrit at his court. Viṭṭhala later shifted to the court of Madhava Singh of the Kacchapa dynasty at whose instance he composed the well-known work on music the *Rāgamañjarī*. He was also a favourite of Akbar, the Great.

Shayesta Khan, Aurangzeb's maternal uncle and general had in Caturbhuja, a poet and a rhetorician like Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha. He composed the poem *Rasakalpadruma* in glorification of his patron.

Lakṣmīpati, a poet of the 17th cen. A.D. flourished during the reign of Aurangzeb's son Muhammed Shah the life-story of whose minister Abdullah he poetizes in his work, the *Abdullācarita*.

The Muslim rulers and the noblemen not only extended patronage to Sanskrit by admitting Sanskrit poets and writers of eminence to their courts providing them with all incentive and encouragement by honouring them and giving them help, financial or otherwise, to enable them to carry on their literary activities unhampered, they also extended patronage to Sanskrit by arranging for the translations of the classics into it. They were actuated herein by the desire to make this vast wealth of knowledge available to their correlative religionists who had to have a thorough acquaintance with Sanskrit before they could execute their assignments. It is through their efforts that the translations into Persian of such works as the *Mahābhārata*, the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* and so on were undertaken and brought successfully to completion. It is interesting to note that at the instance of Akbar the translation into Persian of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* was undertaken. It was his great grandson,

the learned prince Dara Shikoh, who carried out the translation into Persian of the Upaniṣads under the title *Sirr-ul-Akbar*. He also translated the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* into Persian. Among his original compositions may be mentioned the *Samudra-saṅgama* on the technical terms of Hindu pantheism and Sufi phraseology and *Mukalamah-i-Baba Lal Das*, a dialogue between himself and Baba Lal Das in the course of which he dealt with the ideals of Hinduism. An interesting fact that bears reproduction here is that a condensed version of the *Mahābhārata* under the title *Razmnamah*, Book of War, was prepared under orders of Akbar. It was richly decorated with pictures. For its manuscript alone Akbar spent an amount equal to some 40,000 dollars. Abul Fazl contributed the preface to it and its copies were distributed under royal orders to nobles. Among other notable translations of Sanskrit works into Persian, under orders of Muslim kings, mention may be made of the *Atharvaveda* first by a converted Mohammedan of the South Abdul Quadir who could not complete it and later by Haji Ibrahim Sarhindi, the mathematical work, the *Līlāvātī*, by Faizi, the astronomical work, the *Karṇābharaṇa*, under the title *Gurraṭ-i-viz-Zijāt* by Al Beruni, the astronomical work *Tājaka* by Muquammal Khan Gujarati, the historical work, the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* by Maulana Imamuddin, the *Harivaṁśa* by Nasarulla Mustafa, the *Pañcatantra* under the title *Kalilah Damnah* by Maulana Hussain Waiz. An easier adaptation of the last was also attempted under the title *Ayar Danish*. The Naladamayanti story was rendered into Persian under the title *Naldaman*. The *Dvātrim-śatputtalikāsimhāsana* was translated into Persian by Abdul Quadir with the help of a learned Pandit under the title *Khiraḍ Afza-Namah*. The *Gaṅgādhara* and the *Maheśamahānanda* were translated under the general supervision of Abul Fazl.

The first Bengali translation of the *Mahābhārata* was carried out under the orders of the Bengal ruler Nasir Shah (1282-1325 A.D.) to whom the well-known poet Vidyāpati dedicates one of his Padas. Similarly emperor Hussain Shah was responsible for providing inspiration for the translation into Bengali of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. His general Paragal Khan was equally devoted to Sanskrit learning. It was under his orders

that Kavindra Parameśvara translated the *Mahābhārata* upto the Strīparvan which was listened to every evening by himself and by the congregation of his courtiers in his palace. His son Chuti Khan encouraged Śrīkaranandin to undertake a translation of the Āśvamedhikaparvan of the *Mahābhārata* which he successfully brought to completion.

The Muslims were not only great patrons of Sanskrit learning. They, at least some of them, were good composers in it too. A few verses of Shayesta Khan, the maternal uncle of Aurangzeb, are found in a manuscript of Caturbhuja's *Rasakalpadruma* which is preserved in Alwar Maharaja's Manuscript Library.

A more important Muslim composer in Sanskrit, howsoever, is Nawab Abdul Rahim Khan-i-Khana, the noted literateur and the occupant of the highest post of Vakil under Akbar. He wrote nine works apart from preparing the Persian translation of the *Tuzk-i-Babari*, the autobiography of Babar in Turkish :

- i. The *Dohāvalī*
- ii. The *Nagara-śobhā*, a collection of 172 *Dohās*
- iii. The *Barve Nāyikābheda*
- iv. The *Barve*
- v. The *Madanāṣṭaka*
- vi. The *Phuṭakar pada*
- vii. The *Śṛṅgārasoraṭhā*
- viii. The *Rahīm Kāvya* and
- ix. The *Kheṭakautuka*, an astrological work.

Of these v, viii. and ix are in a mixed style, a commingling of Sanskrit and Persian/Arabic or Braj/Awadhi.

When the Mohammedans came to India from Arab lands and Iran they brought with them their languages, Arabic and Persian. For centuries these served as official languages. Later due to local environments a local language with a preponderance of Arabic and Persian words under the name of Urdu came to replace them. Even while Arabic and Persian were the official languages of the Muslims, the local nobility continued to use Braj and Awadhi. Literary composition was predominantly carried out in them. Their beauty and grace attracted the Muslims too. They also took to them for their works.

Sanskrit, though nowhere in the picture at the official or the popular level was by virtue of the vast fund of literature always on the side-lines. It could furnish to the literateurs of the period thoughts and images which they could incorporate in their works in their own media. A study of it was, therefore, considered useful for a high-quality literary production. It was this usefulness which prompted many a Muslim and Hindu writer of the medieval ages to take to its study. Creative writers, at least some of them, were attracted by its charm, its rhythm, its cadence, its richness. They started trying their hand at it. Alongwith it they continued with their own language, Urdu/Persian or Braj/Awadhi. Their writings, therefore, came to appear in all the three languages Persian/Urdu, Braj/Awadhi and Sanskrit. Sometimes they would write exclusively in Persian/Urdu or Braj/Awadhi or Sanskrit. The readers of the contemporary period could understand all of them. It created no difficulty if any one of them or all of them or any two of them were adopted in a composition. It would also prove the proficiency and the skill of the authors in different languages. This resulted in the emergence in the medieval ages of a literary style called the Maṇipravāla where one line in a couplet would be in Sanskrit and the other in Persian/Urdu or one line in Braj/Awadhi and the other in Persian/Urdu. The metre in each case would invariably be that of Sanskrit. Further, Persian or Arabic words would figure in a couplet with Sanskrit suffixes. The earliest example of this is found in the verses of poet Lakṣmīpati, as for example :

1. स नरो गोस्तनीं त्यक्त्वा करोति गोस्तमक्षणाम्।
2. यतस्ततो मयानुक्त्वा जहरं त्यज्यते वपुः।
3. वज्रीरेषु च योषित्सु दुष्मणी यैर्विधीयते।
4. प्रामोशी न विधातव्या वरदारतं विधीयताम्।

The above style has been followed as stated earlier in three of his works by Khan-i-Khana too. In a pure Sanskrit verse in the beginning of his *Kheṭākautuka* he says that he is following in the footsteps of earlier writers who composed their works with an admixture of Persian vocabulary :

फ़ारसीयपदमिश्रितग्रन्थाः शलु पण्डितैः कृताः पूर्वैः।
सम्याप्य तत्पदपथं करवाणि खेटकौतुकं पद्यैः।

A couplet from each of the three works of Khan-i-Khana where he employs the mixed style would suffice to give one an idea of it.

From the *Kheṭakautuka* :

अव्वलखाने यदा रासः खिस्मनाकश्च काहिलः।
मनुजः स्वार्थकर्ता स्याद् भवेद् बेरो तु जाहिलः॥

“If Rāhu were to be in the Janmalagna, a person would remain unhappy, would be indolent, ugly, selfish, needlessly hostile and foolish.”

From the *Rahīma-kāvya* :

एकस्मिन् दिवसावसानसमये मैं था गया बाग में
काचित्त कुरङ्गबालनयना गुल् तोड़ती थी खड़ी।
तां दृष्ट्वा नवयौवनां शशिमुखीं मैं मोह में जा पड़ा
नो जीवामि विना त्वयाशृणु प्रिये तू यार कैसे मिले॥

“One evening I went to a garden when a damsel with eyes like those of the young one of a deer was picking up flowers. When I spotted that young lady with a moonlike face I lost my consciousness. O my darling, listen, I can’t live without you. How can I, O loved one, have you?”

From the *Madanāṣṭaka* :

विगतघननिशीथे चांद की रोशनाई
सघनघननिकुञ्जे कान्ह वंशी बजाई।
सुतपतिगतनिद्रा स्वामियां छोड़ भागीं
मदन शिरसि भूयः क्या बला आन लागी॥

“The moon was shining in the cloudless midnight. Kṛṣṇa played on the flute in a thick bower. The Gopīs woke up and ran leaving their husbands and sons. O Cupid, what a great problem set on the head?”

Khan-i-Khana had not only invariably followed the mixed style only, he has written in pure Sanskrit also often times. A few of his Sanskrit verses are marked with intense spirituality and can easily steal the palm over similar compositions of the Vaiṣṇava saint-poets, e.g.,

अहल्या पाषाणः प्रकृतिपशुरासीत् कपिचमू-
र्खोऽभूच्चाण्डालस्त्रितयमपि नीतं निजपदम्।
अहं चित्तेनास्मा पशुरपि तवाचादिकरणे
क्रियाभिश्चाण्डाला रघुवरं न मामुद्धरति किम्॥

“Ahalyā was a stone. The army of monkeys animal by nature. Guha was Cāṇḍālā. All of those three were taken by you to your abode. I am a stone in mind, an animal in offering you worship etc., and Cāṇḍālā in actions. O Rāma why don't you then come to my rescue?”

Tradition has it that once Jagannātha Trisūlī, a poet friend of Khan-i-khana recited to him a couplet composed by him :

प्राप्य चलानधिकारान् शत्रुषु मित्रेषु बन्धुवर्गेषु।

नोपकृतं नोपकृतं नोपकृतं किंकृतं तेन॥

“If by getting into office, which is not to remain with one permanently, one did not harm the enemies, or favour the friends, or honour the relations, what has one done?”

Khan-i-Khana quietly listened to it, changed only the Mātrā in the first syllable in the second hemistich and recited it back:

नोपकृतं नोपकृतं नोपकृतं किं कृतं तेन।

What greatness! Even in the case of the enemies it should not be अपकृतम्, harm. It should be उपकृतम्, favour.

Khan-i-Khana also introduced the style of himself rendering

- i. some of his own verses
- ii. or those of earlier authors in Braj.

An instance of i. is :

Sanskrit original :

अच्युतचरणतरङ्गिणि शशिशेखरमौलिमालतीमाले।

मम तनुवितरणसमये हरता देया न मे हरिता॥

Braj rendering :

अच्युत चरण तरंगिनी शिवसिर मालति माला।

हरि न बनायो सुरसरि कीजो इंदव माला॥

An instance of ii. is :

Sanskrit original :

याचना हि पुरुषस्य महत्त्वं नाशयत्यखिलमेव तथाहि।

सद्य एव भगवानपि विष्णुवर्णिनो भवति याचितुमिच्छन्॥

Braj rendering :

रहिमन याचकता गहे बड़े छोट है जात।

नारायण हू को भयो बावन अंगूर गात॥

Among other Muslims who could originally compose in Sanskrit mention may be made of Aurangzeb's half-brother the learned Dara Shikoh. The late P.K. Gode of Poona has discovered a Ms. dated 1708 A.D. of the Mughal Prince's Sanskrit composition, the *Samudrasaṅgama* wherein are pointed out the common features of Hinduism and Islam. Since with the same theme the prince had written the work *Majmul Bahrain* (=the confluence of the two oceans) in Persian, it is difficult to say as to whether the Sanskrit work is merely a translation by the prince or by some Pandit of his Persian work. More important than the above work, however, is a letter written in Sanskrit by the prince which was published in 1940 in the *Brahmavidyā*, the *Adyar Library Bulletin*. This shows the unusual command of the prince over Sanskrit which he handles almost in the style of Bāṇa :

स्वस्ति श्रीमद्वैद्यनाथपद्वाराजः प्रपद्यमानागम्यपुण्यसमासाद्यसत्तमा
द्यप्रसाद्यसंभाद्यनिगाद्यकविकदम्बवृन्दारकाधिपाभिवाद्यनिरन्तरास्वा
द्यसुसंवाद्यसंवित्सर्ववेद्यानवद्यहृद्यगद्यपद्यविद्यनवैश्वशालिसर्वविद्या
प्रद्योतनोद्योतसद्यः खद्योतीकृतानिद्यवन्द्यादीन्द्रवृन्देषु॥४॥

After Dara Shikoh, the great name among Muslim creative writers of Sanskrit is that of saint Akbar Shah who adorned the court of Nawab Tana Shah of the Qutb Shahi dynasty of Golconda. Akbar Shah is also known as Kalimullah Hussain or simply as Bade Sahib. He is famous because of his very valuable work in Sanskrit the *Śṛṅgāramañjarī*.¹ In this the devout Muslim starts with paying respects to Hindu divinities and his preceptor, the Guru :

गुरुं गणपतिं दुर्गां वदुकं शिवमच्युतम्।
ब्रह्माणं गिरिजां लक्ष्मीं वाणीं वन्दे विभूतये॥

Akbar Shah or Bade Sahib was born, as he informs us in the Introduction to his work, in the family of Saint Gesu Daraz who lived between 1321-1422 A.D. and who came to the Deccan during the time of Feroz and Ahmed 1st of Bahamani.

The *Śṛṅgāramañjarī* like the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, is a work on Erotics. The author deals with the subject in a scientific and authoritative manner. He says that one of the

special features of his work is the description of the varieties of women called Padminī, etc., which the earlier works quoted by him had not dealt with. He deals with the varieties of the Nāyikās on the basis of the different kinds of moods and reactions in love and also classifies them by Guṇas. As regards the Nāyakas he mentions four types, Bhadra, Datta, Kumāra and Pāñcāla. The corresponding Nāyikā types are Hastinī Citriṇī, Śaṅkhinī and Padminī. The *Śṛṅgāramañjarī* elucidates some unknown facts in Nāyaka-Nāyikā relationship, gives more precise illustrations than those in the earlier treatises and wherever necessary abridges the treatment of the subject. The author's high conception of love with which he makes his definition of the Svīyā, Parakiyā and the Sāmānyā accord, is praiseworthy. Love according to him is only one indivisible object whether it is Svīyā or Parakiyā. It is to him an act of God : *daivayoga eva kāraṇam*.

Well-known scholars like Stein² have said that for a time Sanskrit was adopted as an official language by some of the Mohammedan rulers of Kashmir. Sanskrit inscriptions have been found on a number of Mohammedan tombs there. One of them on a tomb in the cemetery of Baha'uddin Sahib at Srinagar bears a date corresponding to A.D. 1484.

A stone inscription of Dhurail in the District of Dinajpur, West Bengal, of 1455, Saka Era records the construction of a bridge by one Faras Khan, Minister of Ministers, the son of Nrraja Khan in the reign of Muhammed Shah.³

Daraf Khan who is identified with Jaraf Khan and who conquered Saptagrāma in Bengal is said to have written a hymn to the Gaṅgā⁴ which attained some popularity in the contemporary period.

One of the most conspicuous monuments of the cultural intermingling of the Hindus and the Muslims is the appearance in the periodically increasing Upaniṣadic lore of the *Allopaniṣad* which reveals the means of the realization of Allah, God, as the Muslims would see it.

References

1. Edited with a Critical Study by Dr. V. Raghavan, Hyderabad Archaeological Department, Hyderabad, 1951.
2. *Kalhana's Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir*, Vol. I, p. 130, f. n. 2; *Z.D.M.G.*, XL, 9; *Ind. Ant.*, XX, 153.
3. Sanyal, N., List of Inscriptions in the Museums of the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, p. 14.
4. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Calcutta, Vol. XVI, 1847, pp. 393 ff.

Some Peripheral Literature : Lexicography and Medicine

It is not only in poetry, drama, fiction and philosophy that Sanskrit literature exhibits its richness, it does so in technical sciences as well. There have been thinkers in India who have contributed substantially to different technical disciplines a brief assessment of two of which is given here.

Lexicography

The oldest works in this discipline are the *Nighaṇṭus*, collections of Vedic terms which have been explained by Yāska in his etymological treatise, the *Nirukta*. These collections differ in many respects from the dictionaries, the *Kośas*, of the later period. The first pertains to the purpose for which the two types of collections were made. In the case of the *Nighaṇṭus*, it was the interpretation of the sacred texts. In the case of the *Kośas*, it was to supply words to poets and writers and to acquaint them with their precise meanings and gender. The second pertains to their being restricted to any particular subject or otherwise. In the case of the *Nighaṇṭus*, they are limited to a particular text, in the case of the *Kośas*, they do not have any such restriction, drawing words as they do from all types of works. The third pertains to their form. While the *Nighaṇṭus* are in prose, the *Kośas* are in verse, mostly in the *anuṣṭubh* and sometimes also in the *āryā* metre.

The purpose of the *Kośas* being written in verse probably was to help in their being committed to memory. The traditional system of Sanskrit education emphasizes at a very early stage itself the storing in memory by the learner of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini and the *Amarakośa* of Amarasiṃha, thus equipping him with vocabulary and grammatical knowledge that are to stand him in good stead in his going over to any discipline. Were he

to choose writing for self-expression, the value of both need no emphatic assertion. It was the prime motive of placing sufficient vocabulary at the disposal of a prospective writer that possibly accounts for the attribution of dictionaries to such celebrated writers as Bāṇa, Mayūra, Murāri and Śrī Harṣa, the last of whom is credited with having compiled the lists of words with double meanings : *Śleṣārthapadasaṁgraha*.

The Sanskrit *Kośas*, as available at present, can broadly be divided into two types. There are some which are synonymous, listing words with the same meaning and others which are homonymous, listing words with different meanings (*anekārtha*, *nānārtha*) though important synonymous dictionaries have a homonymous section also in them. In neither of the two is followed the alphabetical order, that not being felt essential for the fact of the *Kośas* having to be committed to memory any way. That does not mean that the arrangement of the words in them is arbitrary. It follows other principles. The longer articles come first and the shorter ones later. The common final endings or beginnings may decide their grouping. So may the common gender. The words generally appear in the nominative, singly or in a compound as per the exigencies of the metre, as also the meanings, except in homonymous dictionaries where they appear in the locative. Where the gender is specially mentioned, it is in the locative again, where it is not mentioned, it is indicated by the use of the word in that gender. Some dictionaries have a section on gender at the end. Occasionally the compilers of dictionaries give rather long explanations of words. Normally the meaning is indicated by clubbing an unfamiliar word with a familiar one.

Just as in *Vyākaraṇa* Pāṇini has stolen the limelight, so has among lexicographers *Amarasimha*, the compiler of the celebrated *Nāmalingānuśāsana* which is known much more as the *Amarakośa* after his name. There did precede him lexicographers like Kātyāyana, who is credited with the compilation of the *Nāmamālā*, Vācaspati and Vikramāditya, the compilers of the *Śabdārṇava* and the *Saṁsārāvarta*, and Vyāḍi whose *Utpalinī* incorporating Buddhist terms is often cited. Traditionally being associated with King Vikramāditya, as one

of his nine jewels, Amarasimha can be assigned to the sixth century A.D., though there is no other ground to support this. His work, which is synonymous, is divided into three books or *kāṇḍas* with an appendix on homonyms, indeclinables and genders and is commented upon widely, the more important of his commentators being Kṣīrasvāmin, Sarvānanda, Rāyamukuta and Bhānujīdikṣita. A supplement to it was provided by Puruṣottamadeva under the title *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*. He also compiled the short independent work, the *Hārāvali*. Perhaps as old as Amara is Śāsvata whose homonymous work, the *Anekārthasamuccaya* devotes sometimes a whole verse or a part thereof to the explanation of a term.

Among other dictionaries could be mentioned the *Abhidhānamālā* of Halāyudha, 950 A.D. and the *Vaijayantī* of Yādavaprakāśa, 1050 A.D., the latter rather voluminous. There is a good crop of lexical works in the twelfth century AD. the more prominent of these are the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇī*, a dictionary of homonymous words in six sections again beginning with one-syllable words and ending with six-syllable ones and the *Nighaṇṭuśeṣa* by the prolific Jain writer Hemacandra. Another Jain compiler Dhanañjaya compiled between A.D. 1113-1140 his *Nāmamālā*. In A.D. 1111 Maheśvara compiled his *Viśvaprakāśa* followed a little later by Maṅkha who compiled the *Anekārthakośa* to which he also added a commentary of his own. To A.D. 1200 belongs Keśavasvāmin's *Nānārthāhārṇavasāṅkṣepa*. In the fourteenth century Medinikara wrote his *Anekārthaśabdakośa* which like the *Amarkośa* came to be known after his name as the *Medinikośa*.

There are certain minor works also in the field of Sanskrit lexicography an account of which may not be out of place here. They are *Ekākṣarakośa*, words of one syllable, the *Dvirūpa* or *Trirūpakośa*, words of two or three forms and the dictionaries of certain specific disciplines like, medicine, astronomy and astrology. The Vedic tradition of *Nighaṇṭus* was revived by the Buddhists who produced works such as the *Mahāvvyutpatti* for interpreting the Buddhist terms in prose.

In the field of Sanskrit lexicography a rather interesting work is the *Pārasīprakāśa*, a Persian-Sanskrit Dictionary

compiled in the time of Akbar. In 1693 Vedāṅgarāya used the same title for his dictionary of astronomical and astrological terms.

In 972 Dhanapāla compiled for his sister *Sundarī Paiyalacchī*, a Prākṛta dictionary which was used by Hemacandra for his *Deśināmamālā*, a compilation of Deśi words, words which are neither of Sanskrit, *tatsama*, nor derived from it, *tadbhava*.

This brief survey will enable the reader to form a general idea of the large corpus of Sanskrit lexicographical literature which has listed an enormous number of words in their immense variety of meanings. As the Sanskrit language grew with the incorporation of new words, whether of Indian or foreign origin there appeared deep imprints of foreign influence in disciplines like astronomy, astrology, medicine and natural and physical sciences and as meanings underwent change due to natural processes, the need was felt to compile newer and newer dictionaries to incorporate all the new material in addition to retaining the old one. Hence the appearance of a big crop of dictionaries and lexica over the centuries. These dictionaries and the lexica are a standing testimony to the richness of the Sanskrit language and its minute expressiveness.

Medicine

The origin of the science of medicine or *Āyurveda* can be traced in India, like the origin of the many other kinds of sciences, to the Veda, particularly the *Atharvaveda* which has hymns in it for curing diseases, *bhaiṣajyāni*, and for increasing the life-span, *āyusyaṇi*. There is mention of the twin divine physicians, Aśvinau with wonderful healing powers. In one of the hymns they are said to have supplied a leg to one Viṣpalā: *viṣpalāyai jaṅghām adattam*, the earliest reference in Sanskrit literature to the transplanation of limbs.

The simple folk in India in early periods, as the people elsewhere, had nurtured a belief that diseases are the handiwork of demons or evil spirits and that their cure is possible by warding them off by recitation of *mantras* or performance of magic rites. This belief continued long after the period of the Veda for we have even in the well-developed treatises on

Āyurveda a section on treatment of diseases caused by demons.

Tradition recognizes Āyurveda, also called Vaidyaśāstra, the science of the doctor, as an *upāṅga*, a sub-auxiliary of the *Atharvaveda* which preserves the ancient knowledge of embryology and hygiene.

There is a legend in India of the Ocean of Milk having been churned by gods and demons. For medical science the importance of the legend lies in the appearance from the said Ocean, along with others, of Dhanvantari, the mythical physician, typifying the yearning of the ancient Indians for a physician with extraordinary healing powers. Tradition also associates Dhanvantari with Vikramāditya as one of his nine jewels. Whether the two are identical is open to question.

The Āyurveda is called *aṣṭāṅga*, or eight limbs of topics, which are major surgery, minor surgery, healing of diseases, children's diseases, toxicology, elixirs and aphrodisiacs. Patañjali in his *Mahābhāṣya*, in the context of the scope of the use of word, mentions it along with Purāṇa, Itihāsa and Vākovākya thus attesting to its antiquity. It appears that treatises on specific topics called Tantras or Kalpas were composed first. Later comprehensive treatises called Saṁhitās, which dealt with all the eight topics referred to above, made their appearance.

The sage Ātreya is usually mentioned as the founder of the *Āyurveda*. The Buddhist tradition records the name of one Jīvaka, a pupil of Ātreya who specialized in children's diseases. The *Vinaya piṭaka* and other Buddhist texts show a wide knowledge of elementary medical science, surgical instruments and hot baths, etc.

The earliest of the treatises on medical science in India is the *Carakasamhitā*, the compendium of Caraka, a court physician of Kaniṣka whose wife he helped in a critical case. The work, as it is available now, is not the work of Caraka alone, for it was revised by one Dṛḍhabala who added the last two chapters to it besides contributing seventeen out of twenty-eight or thirty chapters of its Book VI. A native of Kashmir, Dṛḍhabala, ascribed to the eighth century A.D. was the son of Kapilabala and apart from carrying out the revision of the

Carakasamhitā as mentioned above, is credited with the revision of a number of *Tantras* of Agniveśa, a pupil of Punarvasu Ātreya, a fellow student of Bheḍa or Bhela whose *Samhitā* on that score is taken by some to be older than that of Caraka. The *Carakasamhitā* is divided into various sections, called *Sthānas* each dealing with certain specific topics : the *Sūtrasthāna* with remedies, diet and the duties of a doctor; *Nidānasthāna* with eight chief diseases; *Vimānasthāna* with general pathology and medical studies; *Śarīrasthāna* with anatomy and embryology; *Indriyasthāna* with diagnosis and prognosis; *Cikitsāsthāna* with special therapy and the *Kalpa-* and the *Siddhisthānas* with general therapy.

The next great name in the field of Indian medical science is that of Suśruta, described in the *Mahābhārata* as the son of Viśvāmitra. The famous Nāgārjuna is said to have worked on his text. His fame had spread even beyond the confines of India, to Cambodia in the East and Arabia in the West in the ninth and the tenth centuries A.D. as evidenced by the literary tradition of those countries. He was commented upon by Jaiyaṭa, Gayadāsa and Cakrapāṇidatta who had also commented upon the *Carakasamhitā* and whose commentary on Suśruta was supplemented by Ḍallaṇa in the thirteenth century A.D. One Candrāṭa had revised his text on the basis of the commentary of Jaiyaṭa. His work has six sections which, except the last one, the *Uttaratantra*, clearly a later addition, carry the same titles as does the work of Caraka. Its *Sūtrasthāna* deals with general questions, imparting also the information that the author (Suśruta) was the pupil of King Divodāsa of Vārāṇasi. The *Nidānasthāna* concerns itself with pathology, *Śarīrasthāna* with anatomy and embryology, the *Cikitsāsthāna* with therapeutics and the *Kalpasthāna* with toxicology.

The next important work is the *Bhelasamhitā* which carries the same divisions as does the *Carakasamhitā*. As regards osteology, a third version of the system of Ātreya in addition to those of Caraka and Bhela is found in the *Yājñavalkya* and *Viṣṇu Smṛtis* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Agni Purāṇas*.

Vāgbhaṭa, another great name in Indian medical tradition, is recognised to be posterior to Suśruta. Interestingly, there are

two writers of this name, both claiming the same parentage in their works, the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha* and the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṁhitā*. From the fact that one of the two is called Vṛddha Vāgbhaṭa, the Elder Vāgbhaṭa, it would appear that both were different people and it is possible that they might have shared the same descent. The Elder Vāgbhaṭa or Vṛddha Vāgbhaṭa was the son of Simhagupta and the pupil of the Buddhist Avalikita. The younger Vāgbhaṭa appears to have made use of the work of his elder namesake in a mixture of verse and prose while that of the former is in verse.

Other works on medical science include the *Rugviniścaya* of Mādhavakara, an important text on pathology, the *Siddhi-yoga* or *Vṛndamādhava* of Vṛnda, a text giving prescriptions for a number of ailments from fever to poisoning, the *Cikitsāsārasaṅgraha* of Cakrapāṇidatta, a text on therapeutics, and the *Cikitsāmṛta* of Malhaṇa, a work on general medicine.

The *Samhitā* of Śārṅgadharma is commented upon by Vopadeva, son of the physician Keśava and a protege of Hemādri (1300 century A.D.) who also wrote a *Śataślokī*, a work on powders, pills and the use of the pulse in diagnosis.

Numerous other works on medicine came to be written in later centuries, the more noteworthy of them being the *Cikitsākalikā* of Tīṣata (fourteenth century), the *Bhāvprakāśa* of Bhāvamiśra (sixteenth century) and the *Vaidyajīvana* of Lolimbarāja (seventeenth century). There also appeared large numbers of monographs on different diseases including the one on the diseases of plants, the *Vṛkṣāyurveda* of Surapāla.

Apart from herbs, the *kāṣṭhaśuśadhas*, prescribed as medicines, the texts on Āyurveda record a number of other preparations with effective curative properties. They are the *bhasmas* of various metals especially of gold and silver. The treatment extended itself even to the use of quick-silver (*pārada*) in its various formulations, and sulphur and other acids for treating malignant diseases. The effectiveness of the medication is ensured with its accompaniment, the *anupāna*, milk, butter milk, curd, the decoction (*kvātha*) and so on. The treatment also rests on certain types of diets to be partaken for certain periods, the *kalpas*, to subsist on milk alone or curd alone for twenty-one days or forty days and so on.

The ancient Indians had achieved a high degree of accuracy in diagnosing the ailment by feeling the pulse, a tradition that has come down to the present-day. They had evolved a theory of the three humours, the *Vāta* (wind), *Pitta* (bile) and *Kapha* (phlegm) the disturbance of which is the cause of the disease. Efforts have, therefore, to be made to keep them on an even keel which can be done by proper health care. *Āyurveda* is the science of good health and not only the curing of diseases.

संस्कृतसाहित्ये हास्यरसः

काव्यशास्त्रे परिगणितेषु रसेषु हास्यमप्येको रसः। यद्यपि संस्कृतसाहित्ये हास्यरसविरलताऽक्षिशूलतामुपैति प्रत्येकस्यापि सुरभारतीसाहितीजुषस्तथापि सर्वथात्र हास्यरसाभाव इति न सुशकं वक्तुम्। यदा वयं नाटकादीन् परिशीलयामो भणप्रहसनादीन्वा समालोचनालोचनविषयीकुर्मस्तदा न सुरगिरि सर्वथा हास्यरसाभावप्रतियोगिताभाव इति वक्तुं पारयामः। इदन्त्वभ्युपेयो विशालेऽस्मिन् न्याय, वेदान्त, साङ्ख्य कल्लोललोले वेदशास्त्रादिनैकनक्राकुले सुरगवीपारावारे हास्यस्य विरल एवोपलम्भ इति। मन्यामहे गम्भीरास्वाध्यात्मिकीषु चर्चासु कृतोद्यमाः पूर्वे सुरयो न हास्यं बहुमेनिरे। साहित्ये च गम्भीर एव विषयः प्रतिपाद्यस्तेन प्राकृतवद्भास्यादिकं परिगृह्णाना मा लोकस्य तिरस्कृतिभाजनं भूमेति चाभ्युपजग्मिरे। अयमेवात्र हेतुरुतान्य इति न सम्यगुनेतुं पारयामः। परं हास्यस्य विरल उपलम्भ इति नात्र कस्यापि विसंवादः।

हास्यस्याधिकतर उपलम्भो नाटकेष्वेव दृश्यते। तत्रापि विदूषको विटशकारादिर्वा प्राधान्येन हास्यं जनयति। विदूषको हि संस्कृतनाटकेषु विकृतेनाङ्गेन वचसा वेषेण च हास्यमुत्पादयति। तथा चाहुः—

विकृताङ्गवचोवेषैर्हास्यकारी विदूषकः।

विदूषको हि यत्र तत्र नाटकेषु महाब्राह्मण इति व्यपदिश्यते। ऐहिकेषु विषयभोगेषु च सुतरां प्रसितचेता दृष्टिपथमवतरति। तथा च स्वप्नवासवदत्ते पद्मावतीप्रासादे निवसतो यथेच्छस्नानाभ्यवहरणादि विविधानन्द-निर्भरचेतसो विदूषकस्योक्तिः—

इदानीं राजप्रासादेषूष्यते। अन्तःपुरदीर्घिकासु स्नायते। मधुरमधुराणि
सुकुमाराणि च मोदकखाद्यानि खाद्यन्ते। यत्सत्यमनप्सरः संवास
उत्तरकुरुवासो मयानुभूयत इति।

भोजनप्रियत्वं हि विदूषकस्य यत्र तत्र वर्ण्यमानं भूयो हास्यमुत्पादयति। (तथा च शाकुन्तले माढव्य स्योक्तिः—अहं बुभुक्षया खादयितव्य इव)। उदरम्भरिरसौ महाब्राह्मणो बह्वश्नाति न च तदशितं जीर्यतीति तस्य भोजनभट्टत्वं विनोदयति तमां श्रोतुं द्रष्टुं च। तथा च स्वप्ननाटके चेटीं प्रति नाह भोक्ष्य इत्यत्र हेतूपन्यासात्मकं विदूषकवचः—

अधन्यस्य मे कोकिलाक्षिपरिवर्त इव कुक्षिपरिवर्तः संवृत्तः

CC-0. Prof. Satya Vrat Shastri Collection, New Delhi. Digitized by eGangotri
विकृतेन वचसाऽपि विदूषको हास्यं जनयतीति नाविदितं कस्यापि। अस्ति ब्रह्मदत्तं

नाम नगर काम्पिल्यो नाम राजेति तस्य विपरीतवचः स्मेरानान् विदधाति सर्वानपि।
चतुरैर्हास्यगर्भैरालापैश्च स सुतरां विनोदयति। तथा चाविमारके विदूषकस्यान्यस्य चानुचरस्य
संवादः —

अनुचर : आर्य अयं क्षपणको मम मोदकमल्लकं गृहीत्वा न ददाति।

विदूषक : निर्यातय भो निर्यातय मोदकानि कर्पूरिकामोदनिर्घराणि दुग्धफेनपाण्डुराणि।
मा ते खादितानि क्षयमुत्पादयन्तु।

अन्यत्राप्यविमारके नायिकां रुदतीमालोक्य सोऽपि रोदितुमिच्छति—

अथवाऽहमपि रोदिमि। मम नयनाद्वाष्पं न निर्गच्छति। यदा मे
पितोपरतस्तदापि महताऽरम्भेण रोदितुमारब्धः। मम नयानाद्वाष्पं न निर्गच्छति।

अत्र सन्दर्भे रोदितुकामोऽपि विदूषको बाष्पाभावान्नरोदितु शक्नोतीत्यस्य पितुनिधनस्य
चोल्लेखः सुतरां हास्यकारी। एवमेव मृच्छकटिकेऽपि प्रतिचेष्टस्य विदूषकस्य च संवादः —

चेष्ट : (प्रविष्य) आर्य वन्दे!

विदू : कुत्र त्वमीदृशे दुर्दिने अन्धकारे आगतः?

चेष्ट : अरे! एषा सा।

विदू : का एषा सा?

चेष्ट : एषा सा।

विदू : किमिदानीं दास्याः पुत्र दुर्मिक्षकाले वृद्धकरङ्क इव श्वासायसे एषा सा
सेति।

चेष्ट : अरे त्वमपि इदानीमिन्द्रमखकामुक इव सुष्ठु किं काकायसे काकेति।

चेष्ट : (स्व.) भवतु, एवं भणिष्यामि। अरे! प्रश्नं ते दास्यामि।

विदू : अहं ते मुण्डे पादं दास्यामि।

चेष्ट : अरे जानीहि तावत् कस्मिन् काले चूताः मुकुलयन्ति।

विदू : अरे! दास्याः पुत्र ग्रीष्मे।

चेष्ट : अरे! नहि नहि।

अत्र विदूषकश्चारुदत्तं पृच्छति कस्मिन्काले प्रसूतागम इति। स च वसन्तऋतुं
निर्दिशति। एवमेवापरस्य चेष्टप्रश्नस्योत्तरं सेनेति। तदनन्तरवर्ती संलाप उद्भ्रियते—

चेष्ट : अरे! द्वे अपि एकस्मिन्कृत्वा शीघ्रं भण।

विदू : से ना वसन्ते।

चेष्ट : ननु परिवर्त्य भण।

- विदू : (कायेन परिवृत्य) से ना वसन्ते।
 चेट : अरे मूर्ख! पदे परिवर्तय।
 विदू : (पादौ परिवर्त्य) से ना वसन्ते।
 चेट : अरे मूर्ख! अक्षरपदे परिवर्तय।
 विदू : (विचिन्त्य) वसन्तसेना।
 चेट : एषा सा आगता।

अत्रेदं विविच्यते-सन्ति कानिचिन्नाटकानि यत्र हास्यकारी विदूषको कृगोचरतामुपैति। न हि तत्रोपलभ्यते विदूषकं नाम पात्रम्। तत्र भवभूतिनाटकानि निदर्शनम्। एतेन तत्कर्तरि न हास आस्पदं चकार। सर्वथा हास्यरसशून्यतां स्वकीयां गोपायितुकामः स तत्स्थाने रौद्र, वीर, वीभत्सादीन् रसान्वर्णयामासेति केचित्। तदेतन्न विचारसहम्। भवभूतौ सर्वथा हास्यरसाभाव इति यदुच्यते तत्साहसमेव। प्रथमेऽङ्के चित्रदर्शनकाले चित्रारोपितानि पुराणानि वृत्तान्तान्युपदर्शयन्तं लक्ष्मणं प्रति देव्याः सीताया उक्तिर्भवभूतेर्हास्यप्रियत्वं सुतरामुद्घोषयति। रामादीनां वधूनिर्दर्शयन् स यदा स्वभार्याम् उर्मिलामुपप्लुत्य श्रुतकीर्तिं दर्शयति तदा देवी सीता कृतमन्दस्मिता अङ्गुल्या उर्मिलां निर्दिशन्ती लक्ष्मणं मधुरमुपहसति-वत्स इयमपि अपर का? एवमेव षष्ठेऽङ्के उपस्थितेषु जनकादिषु वृद्धजनेषु बालस्य लवस्य चन्द्रकेतुविषयिणी बालसुलभा सरला सुभगा चोक्तिरीषद्धासं जनयति। कोऽयं चन्द्रकेतुरिति कुतूहलाकुलचेतसो लवस्य जिज्ञासामुपशमयितुं द्वितीयसय रामायणकथापुरुषस्य लक्ष्मणस्यायमपत्यमिति राजर्षिजनकस्य वच उपश्रुत्य लवस्तत्कालमेव वक्ति -उर्मिलापुत्रस्तर्हि मैथिलस्य राजर्षेर्दौहित्रः।

लवस्यैव सम्बन्धाभिधाने द्राविडप्राणायामः सर्वानुपस्थितान् विनोदयति। तथा चाह राजर्षिः -

जनक : (सस्मितम्)-आविष्कृतं कथाप्रावीण्यं कुमारेण।

एवमेव विदूषकाभाववति मुद्राराक्षसेऽपि हासगर्भाणि वचांसि विरलान्यपि न सर्वथा तदभावप्रतियोगिताभाववन्ति। तथा हि पञ्चमेऽङ्के विहितमार्गा देशकुशलशकुनः करेण पत्रं गृह्णानः सिद्धार्थकः क्षपणकमालोक्य दिनस्य शुभाशुभत्वं पृच्छति-

सिद्धार्थक : तस्मात् कथयतु भदन्तः कीदृशोद्य दिवस इति।

क्षपणक : श्रावक! मुण्डितमुण्डो नक्षत्राणि पृच्छसि?

एवं मालतीमाधवप्रबोधचन्द्रोदयादिषु कृतिषु हास्यरसाभाव इति त्वरितं वचः।

यद्यपि नाटकादिषु विदूषक एव प्रमुखतया हासमुपजनयति तथापि पात्राणां गूढानि नर्मवचांसि विनोदयन्ति सहृदयहृदयानीति न भूयसीनां गिरामवकाशः। तथा च स्वप्नवासवदत्ते आसन्नपरिभाषामुद्धाने सन्दुक्क्रीडनेतारवत्कर्तुं पद्मावतीं प्रति वासवदत्तया उपहासगर्भं वचः-

वासवदत्ता : हला! कन्दुकेन क्रीडन्त्याऽधिकसमुपरागौ परकीयाविव ते हस्तौ संवृत्तौ।

पद्मावती : अपेहि मा मामुपहस!

एवमेवोत्तरे रामचरिते शिष्याणां परस्परालाप उपहासं जनयति -

भण्डायन : अरुन्धतीसहायो भगवान् वसिष्ठः सम्प्राप्तः।

सौधातकि : मया पुनर्ज्ञातिं व्याघ्रो वा वृको वा एष इति।

भाण्डायन : धिङ्मूर्ख! किम्प्रलपसि।

सौधातकि : तेन परापतितेनैव वराकिका कल्याणिका मङ्गमङ्गायिता।

तथैव च स्वप्ननाटके चतुर्थेऽङ्के राज्ञ उदयनस्य वसन्तकस्य च हासजनकः संवादः -

राजा : किं बलात्कारेण ज्ञास्यसि

वसन्तक : आम्।

राजा : पश्यामस्तवात्।

वसन्तक : प्रसीदतु प्रसीदतु महाराजः।

क्वचिन्नाटकेषु ग्रामीणानां ग्रामसुलभा उक्तयोपि स्मितिमुत्पादयन्ति। तथा च पञ्चरात्रे गवामपहरणाय सम्प्राप्तान्कौरवानित्थं वर्णयति ग्रामवृद्धः -

भो भोः! एते केचिदधिपिण्डपाण्डरैश्छत्रैश्चशकटैरुह्यमानाः अत्र छत्राणां दधिपिण्डोपमानत्वं रथानां चाश्वशकटेति वर्णनं कल्पते भूयसे हासाय नागरिकस्य जनस्य। एवं चारुदत्ते शकारस्य “दहते मे हृदय यथा चर्मखण्ड” मिति वचोऽनल्पं हासमुपजनयति। हृदयदहनं चर्मखण्डदहनानुरूपमिति शकारानुकूलमेव वचः।

न केवलं विकृताङ्गवचोवेषाणामेव हास्यस्य समुत्थापकताऽपि तु विविधाभिः घटनाभिरप्यस्य जन्यजनकभावः सम्बन्धः। तथा चाविमारके अप्रत्याशितघटनाचक्रकृतसंमोहो राजा कुन्तिभोजो यदा नारद सकाशात्कुन्तिभोजेति नाम्ना व्यपदिश्यमानं राजानं शृणोति अहमेव कुन्तिभोजो नारदेनाभिप्रेयत इत्यसंविदानश्च पृच्छति मुने! कोऽयं कुन्तिभोज इति। तदा स नारदेन सस्मितमुपहस्यते

पिता कुरुङ्गया भूपालो वैरन्त्यनगरेश्वरः।

दूर्योधनस्य तनयः कुन्तिभोजो भवान्नु॥

काव्य प्रयोजन विचार

जो कोई भी कार्य किया जाता है उसका कोई न कोई प्रयोजन होता है। कहा भी है - प्रयोजन मनुद्दिश्य न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्तते। अथ च -

सर्वस्मै हिशास्त्रस्य कर्मणांवाऽपि कस्याचित्।
यावत्प्रयोजनं नोक्तं तावत् तत्केन गृह्यते॥

प्रयोजनों का शास्त्रकारों ने दो श्रेणियों में विभक्त किया है - दृष्ट और अदृष्ट। इन दोनों ही श्रेणियों की दृष्टि से काव्य के प्रयोजन पर प्रस्तुत लेख में विचार है।

भरतमुनि

भरतमुनि ने काव्य शब्द से दृश्य काव्यों को ही लिया है। दृश्य काव्य के फल बतलाते हुए उन्होंने कहा है -

धर्म्यं यशस्यमायुष्यं हितं बुद्धिविवर्धनम्।
लोकोपदेशजननं नाट्यमेतद् भविष्यति॥
विश्रान्तिजननं लोके नाट्यमेतद् भविष्यति॥

उक्त वचन के अनुसार नाट्य अथवा दृश्य काव्य के 1. धर्म 2. यज्ञ, 30 आयु, 4. हित, 5. बुद्धि-वृद्धि, 6. लोकोपदेश दक्षता, 7, परमाविश्रान्ति प्राप्ति ये सात प्रयोजन सिद्ध होते हैं। इनमें से चरमविश्रान्ति प्राप्ति मुख्य प्रयोजन है। यह अर्थात् कीर्ति की प्राप्ति केवल कवि को ही प्राप्त होती है। अन्य फलों की प्राप्ति कवि और सामाजिक दोनों को होती है।

मामह

मामह के काल में काव्य की कोटि में श्रव्य काव्य भी आने लगा था। इन्होंने काव्य प्रयोजन बतलाते हुए कहा है -

धर्मार्थकामआदौषु वेचदाव्यं कलासु च।
करोति कीर्तिं प्रीतिं च साधु काव्यनिषेवणम्।

इनके अनुसार 1. चतुर्वर्ग फलप्राप्ति, 2. कलाओं में विक्षणता, 3. कीर्ति, 4. और प्रीति में चार काव्य के प्रयोजन हैं। इन्होंने इन चार फलों में ही सरतोक्त सात प्रयोजनों का समावेश कर लिया है। धर्म, आयु और हित का प्रथम फल में तथा बुद्धि वृद्धि और लोकोपदेश-दक्षता का द्वितीय फल में समावेश स्पष्ट है। परमाविश्रान्ति प्राप्ति को उन्होंने

प्रीति शब्द से संकेतित किया है और पर्यायवाची शब्द कीर्ति से यश का उल्लेख किया है। इस प्रकार सरतोक्त सातों प्रयोजनों का ममाह ने भी स्वीकार कर लिया है। उनकी विशेषता यह है कि ऐसे शब्दों से उन्होंने प्रयोजन निरूपण किया है कि भरतमुनि से अधिक व्यापक क्षेत्र उनमें आ सके। काव्यप्रयोजनों में वे कीर्ति से अधिक प्रीति रखते थे, ऐसा उनके इन पद्यों से प्रतीत होता है—

उपयुषामपि दिवं सन्ति बन्ध विधायिनाम्।
 आस्त एव निरातङ्कं कान्तं काव्यमयं वपुः॥
 रुणाद्धि यंदसी चास्य यावत्कीर्तिरनखरी।
 तावत् किलायमध्यास्ते सुकृती वैबुधं पदम्॥
 ततो भिवाच्छता कीर्तिं स्थेमसीमा भुवतः स्थितेः।
 यत्नो विदित वेद्येयः काव्यलक्षणः॥

आचार्य दण्डी

आचार्य दण्डी लोक-व्युत्पत्तिकों ही काव्य का फल मानते हैं। फल या प्रयोजन शब्द के उल्लेख से तो कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता परन्तु जिस कारिका से यह जाना जा सकता है कि काव्य का क्या फल उनके मन में है वह इस प्रकार है -

अतः प्रजानां व्युत्पत्ति ममिसन्धाय सूरयः।
 वाचां विचित्रमागा र्ग निबन्धुः क्रियाविधिम्॥

इस कारिका के अनुशीलन से कहा जा सकता है कि आचार्य दण्डी केवल व्युत्पत्ति (वागवैचित्र्य ज्ञान) को ही काव्य फल मानते थे। पूर्वाचार्यों से स्वीकृत बुद्धिविवर्धन या कला-वैचक्षण्य का दण्डी-स्वीकृत व्युत्पत्ति रूप फल से संगृह हो जाता है पर अन्य प्रयोजनों का नहीं। विशेषण उत्पत्तिः विभिन्न अभीष्ट फलोपलब्धि रूप अर्थ में यदि व्युत्पत्ति शब्द को लिया जाय, तो पूर्व सभी फलों का संग्रहो हो जाता है। सूरयः और निबन्धुः से दण्डी से सम्भवतः भरतमुनि प्रभृति आचार्यों की ओर संकेत किया है और उन आचार्यों ने पूर्वोक्त फल माने हैं। वे सभी फल दण्डी को भी अभिप्रेत थे यदि यह कहा जाय तो सम्भवतः विशेष अनुचित न होगा। हां इतना स्पष्ट है कि आचार्य दण्डी ने शब्दतः अन्य फलों की चर्चा नहीं की।

आचार्य वामन

आचार्य वामन ने संक्षिप्त भाषा में काव्यफलों को दिखलाया है। उनका सूत्र है— काव्यं सद् दृष्टादृष्टार्थं प्रीतिथार्ति हेतुत्वात्। इस सूत्र के भावानुसार काव्य के दो फल लक्षित होते हैं—दृष्ट और अदृष्ट। दृष्ट से उन्होंने प्रीति को लिया है और अदृष्ट से कीर्ति को। उन्हीं के द्वारा रचित कृतिस्थ श्लोकों से प्रतीत होता है कि वे भी भामह की ही तरह कीर्ति को प्रमुखता देते थे -

प्रतिष्ठां काव्यबन्धस्य यशसः सरणिं विदुः।
 अकीर्तिं वर्तिनी 'त्वेन' कुक्कवित्यविडम्बनाम्॥

कीर्तिं स्वर्गं फलामाहुः ससंसारं विपश्चितः।

अकीर्तिं तु निरालोकं नरकोदेशं हेतुं काम्॥

तस्मात् कीर्तिमुपादातुं कीर्तिं च निर्वाह्येतुम्।

इस कारिका के अनुशीलन से कहा जा सकता है कि आचार्य दण्डी केवल व्युत्पत्ति (वाग्वेचित्र्य ज्ञान) को ही काव्य फल मानते थे। पूर्वाचार्यों से स्वीकृत बुद्धिवर्धन या कला-वैचक्षण्य का दण्डी-स्वीकृत व्युत्पत्तिः विभिन्न अभीष्ट फलोपलब्धि रूप अर्थ में यदि व्युत्पत्ति शब्द को लिया जाय, तो पूर्व सभी फलों का संग्रह हो जाता है। सूर्यः और निबन्धुः से दण्डी ने सम्भवतः भरतमुनि प्रभृति आचार्यों की ओर संकेत किया है और उन आचार्यों ने पूर्वोक्त फल माने हैं। वे सभी फल दण्डी को भी अभिप्रेत थे यदि यह कहा जाय तो सम्भवतः विशेष अनुचित न होगा। हां इतना स्पष्ट है कि आचार्य दण्डी ने शब्दतः अन्य फलों की चर्चा नहीं की।

आचार्य वामन

आचार्य वामन ने संक्षिप्त भाषा में काव्यफलों को दिखलाया है। उनका सूत्र है—काव्यं सद् दृष्टादृष्टार्थं प्रीतिथार्ति हेतुत्वात्। इस सूत्र से भावानुसार काव्य के दो फल लक्षित होते हैं—दृष्ट और अदृष्ट। दृष्ट से उन्होंने प्रीति को लिया है और अदृष्ट से कीर्ति को। उन्हीं के द्वारा रचित कृतिस्थ श्लोकों से प्रतीत होता है कि वे भी भामह की ही तरह कीर्ति को प्रमुखता देते थे—

प्रतिष्ठां कायबन्धस्य यशसः सरणिं विदुः।

अकीर्तिं वर्तिनी 'त्वेव' कुकवित्त्वविडम्बनाम्॥

कीर्तिं स्वर्गं फलामाहुः ससंसारं विपश्चितः।

अकीर्तिं तु निरालोकं नरकोदेशं हेतुं काम्॥

तस्मात् कीर्तिमुपादातुं कीर्तिं च निर्वाह्येतुम्।

सुन्दर काव्य की रचना ही यश की प्राप्ति का मार्ग कहा जाता है। दूसरी ओर कुकवित्त्व की विडम्बना को अकीर्ति मार्ग कहा जाता है। विद्वानों ने कीर्ति को संसार-स्थापिनी और स्वर्ग फलदायिनी कहा है। इसलिये अकीर्ति के विनाश और कीर्ति के लाभ के लिये काव्य निर्माण करना चाहिये। आचार्य वामन ने करोति कीर्तिं प्रीतिं च साधु काव्य निबन्धनम् से जो भामह ने कहा है तावन्मात्र का ही कीर्ति प्रीति-हेतुत्वात् से संग्रह किया है। धर्मार्थ काममोक्षेषु वैचक्षण्यं कलासु च की ओर उन्होंने ध्यान नहीं दिया।

आनन्दवर्धनाचार्य

आचार्य आनन्दवर्धन ने स्पष्ट रूप से काव्य प्रयोजन के विषय में कुछ नहीं कहा पर उनके ग्रन्थ के अध्ययन से प्रतीत होता है कि प्रीति रूप फल को वे भी स्वीकार करते थे। यह बात उन्होंने अभिधा से नहीं व्यञ्जना से कही है। उन्होंने ध्वनि स्वरूप निरूपण-फल का उल्लेख करते हुए कहा है—तत्र भूमि सहृदयमनः प्रीतिर्यथास्वरूपम्।

कतिपय समीक्षकों के अनुसार उन्होंने सफलोपदेश करण सामर्थ्य को काव्य-फल माना है। उनका मत इस पंक्ति पर आधारित है-

विनययोन्मुखी कर्तुं काव्यशोमार्थं मेव वा।

आचार्य रुद्रट

आचार्य रुद्रट ने 1. धर्म, 2. अर्थ, 3. अनथोपक्षम, 4. (ऐहिक और आमुष्मिक) सुख प्राप्ति, 5. कीर्ति तथा अन्य विविध फलों की प्राप्ति काव्य से मानी है। काव्य प्रयोजनों का निरूपण उन्होंने काव्यालंकार की प्रकमाध्वाय की 4-13 तक की कारिकाओं में किया है। वहीं से उपर्युक्त उनका मत स्पष्ट हो जाता है।

आचार्य कुन्तक

इन्होंने परमानन्द प्राप्ति को काव्य का परम प्रयोजन माना है। अन्य प्रयोजनों की चर्चा भी इन्होंने की है पर परमानन्द प्राप्ति को ही उन्होंने विशेष महत्त्व दिया है-

धर्मादिसाधनोपायः सुकुमारकमोदितः।

काव्यबन्धो भिजातानां हृदयाल्हादकारकः॥

व्यवहारपरिष्यदसौन्दर्यं व्यवहारिभिः।

सत्काव्याधिगमादेव नूतनौचित्यमाप्यते।

चतुर्वीफलास्वादमप्यतिक्रम्यतद्विदाम्।

काव्यामृतरसेनान्तश्चमत्कारो वितन्यते॥

इन कारिकाओं के अनुसार यह कहा जा सकता है कि कुन्तकाचार्य काव्य से 1. चतुर्वर्गफलप्राप्ति, 2. व्यवहारज्ञान, 3. परमाह्लादप्राप्ति इन तीन फलों का लाभ मानते हैं। इनमें भी परमाह्लादप्राप्ति को उन्होंने इसलिये महत्त्व दिया कि वह अन्य शास्त्रों के अध्ययन से अप्राप्य है। इसकी पुष्टि में वे कहते हैं -

कटुकौषधं वच्छास्त्रमविघनाशनम्।

आह्लादयामृतं वत्काव्यं मविवेकमदायहम्॥

आयत्यंजं तदात्वं च रसनियन्द्सुन्दरम्।

येन सम्पद्यते काव्यं तदिदानीं विचार्यते॥

आचार्य महिमभट्ट

आचार्य महिमभट्ट ने स्वतंत्र रूप से काव्यफलों का निरूपण तो नहीं किया पर प्रसंगवश जो उन्होंने कहा है उससे ज्ञात होता है कि काव्य को वे कृत्याकृत्य प्रवृत्ति निवृत्तयुपदेश फलक मानते हैं। उन्होंने काव्य का लक्षण प्रस्तुत करते हुए कहा है -
कविव्यापारो हि विभावादिसंयोजनात्मा रक्षामि व्यक्त्यव्याभिचारी काव्यमुच्यते। काव्य के दो भेद उन्हें अभिमत हैं- तच्चाभिनयानभिनेयार्थत्वेन द्विविधम्। आगे चलकर वे कहते हैं- तच्चो मयमपि च तत्तच्छास्त्रवद्विधिनिषेध विषयव्युत्पत्तिफलम्। अन्य शास्त्रों से भी

यह फल प्राप्त हो सकता हो तो काव्यध्ययन क्यों किया जाय? इन प्रश्न के उत्तर में वे कहते हैं- केवल व्युत्पाद्यजनजाड्याजाड्यतारतम्यापेक्षया काव्यनाट्य शास्त्ररूपी यमुपायमात्रभेदो न फलमेदः।

कोचिद्वाचां स्थितमविषये तत्त्वमूचुस्तदीयं

तेन ब्रूमस्य हृदयमनः प्रीतये तत्स्वरूपम्॥

सहृदयमनः प्रीतये में प्रीतिशब्द की व्याख्या करते हुए वे कहते हैं- प्रीतिशब्देन मनस्या नन्दो निर्वृत्तात्मा चमत्कारापरपर्यायः। रोतृणां च व्युत्पत्ति प्रीती यथपि स्तः, तथापि तत्र प्रीतिरेव प्राधान्यम्। अन्यथा प्रमुसमितोभ्यो वेदादिभ्यो मित्रसमितेभ्यश्चेतिहासादिभ्यो व्युत्पत्तिहेतुभ्यः को स्यकाव्यरूपस्य व्युत्पत्तिहेतोर्त्रायासमितत्वलक्षणो विशेष इति प्राथान्येनानन्द एवोक्तः। चतुर्वर्ग व्युत्पत्तेरपि नन्द एव पार्यन्तिकं फलम्।

उक्त उद्धरण से स्पष्ट है कि आचार्य अभिनव गुप्त चतुर्वर्ग -फलप्राप्ति और व्युत्पत्त्यादि के साथ-साथ परमानन्द को काव्य का फल मानते हैं। विशेषता यह है कि आचार्य कुन्तक के समान वे भी सद्यः पर निवृत्ति को सर्वोपरि स्थान देते हैं।

आचार्य मम्मट

आचार्य मम्मट ने पूर्ववर्ती समस्त आचार्यों के आशयों का संग्रह करके और उनके गौरवावनुसार काव्य के छः फल माने हैं-

काव्यं यशसं श्रुतं व्यवहारं विदे शिवेतरक्षतमो

सद्यः परनिवृत्तये कान्तासम्मिततयोपदेशमुजे॥

भरत-मम्मट तुलना

उक्त कारिका से यह ज्ञात होता है कि काव्य से 1. यश, 2. अर्थ (हस्तमशनादि), 3. व्यवहार (आचार ज्ञान), 4. शिवेतर क्षति (अमंगलापनयन), 5. परनिवृत्ति (परमानन्द), 6. उपदेश-योग (उपदेश दक्षता), ये छः प्रयोजन सिद्ध होते हैं भरतमुनि ने जो सात प्रयोजनों की परिगणना की है उनमें मम्मट परिगणित प्रयोजन प्रायः समाज हैं। भरतमुनि ने जहाँ स्पष्ट शब्दों में प्रयोजनों की गणना न कर व्यापक शब्दों में प्रयोजनों को दिखलाया है वहाँ मम्मटाचार्य ने निश्चित शब्दों में उन्हें दिखलाया है। निम्न निर्दिष्ट तालिका के माध्यम से भरत एवं मम्मट के मतों का तुलनात्मक निरीक्षण इस प्रकार है -

भरतमुनि

1. धर्म
2. यश
3. आयुष्य
4. हित
5. बुद्धिविवर्धन

मम्मट

1. शिवेतरक्षति
2. यश
3. शिवेतरक्षति
4. अर्थ
5. व्यवहारज्ञान

- | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| 6. लोकोपदेशजनन | 6. कान्तासाम्मितोपदेश |
| 7. विश्रान्तिजनन | 7. सद्यः परनिर्वृति |

भामह-मम्मट तुलना

भामह ने जो चार फल काव्य के बतलाये हैं उनका भी संग्रह मम्मट प्रतिपादित काव्य प्रयोजनों में हो जाता है। इसे भी तालिका से इस प्रकार स्पष्ट किया जा सकता है -

भरतमुनि

मम्मट

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. धर्मार्थ काममोक्ष वैचक्षण्य | 1. अर्थकृते, शिवेतरक्षतये, सद्यः पर निर्वृतये |
| 2. कलावैचक्षण्य | 2. व्यवहारविदे |
| 3. कीर्ति | 3. यशसे |
| 4. प्रीति | 4. सद्यः पनिर्वृति |

फलपात्रविवेक

मम्मट-प्रतिपादित छः फलों में से यश, अर्थ और अनितरसाधारण उपदेश प्रावीण्य ये तीन फल मुख्य रूप से कवि को प्राप्त होते हैं। अवशिष्ट तीन कवि और श्रोता को सामान्य रूप से प्राप्त होते हैं। कुछ विद्वानों का मत है कि यश, धन और शिवेतर क्षति ये तीन कविगत फल हैं और शेष दो सहृदय को ही प्राप्त होते हैं। इस मत के अनुसार यशः प्राप्ति में दोनों की जो समानता बतलाई गई है उसकी संगति नहीं बैठती। वैसे इस प्रकार का विभाग सम्भवतः मम्मट को अभीष्ट नहीं था इसीलिये उन्होंने सभी प्रयोजनों को उभयगत बतलाया है -कवेः सहृदयस्य चं

फलोपपत्ति

उक्त फलोपलब्धिकी उत्पत्ति में मम्मट ने यशः प्राप्ति के प्रसंग में कालिदासादीनामिव यशः कहा है। आदि कवि वाल्मीकि अथवा महर्षि व्यास को न स्मरण कर दृष्टान्त के समय कालिदास का उल्लेख यह संकेत करता है कि ऐसे कवियों में कालिदास ही अग्रगण्य हैं जिन्हें मात्र काव्य-रचना से प्रसिद्धि प्राप्त हुई है।

अर्थ प्राप्ति के प्रसंग में भी मम्मट ने एक दृष्टान्त दिया है और वह है घावक कवि का घावलादीभावित ...। कहा जाता है कि रत्नावली नाटिका महाराज श्री हर्ष की अपनी रचना नहीं है। उन्होंने तात्कालिक कवि घावक को प्रचुर धन देकर अपने नाम से नाटिका की रचना करवाई।

राजा या मंत्री आदि के प्रति कैसा व्यवहार होना चाहिये इसका ज्ञान काव्य से सुगमरीत्मा होता है अतः व्यवहार ज्ञान भी सोपपातिक हुआ।

शिवेतर क्षति के लिए मम्मट ने एक रोचक कथानक प्रस्तुत किया है। कहा जाता है कि बाण कवि का श्यालक मयूर कवि था। दोनों में प्रगाढ़ स्नेह सम्बन्ध था। ज्यों ही एक कविता बनाता था तो दूसरे को सुनाने दौड़ पड़ता था। एक रात मयूर ने एक कविता

बनाई और उसे सुनाने के लिए वे तत्काल बाण के यहाँ पहुँच गये। बाण उस समय अपनी मानिनी पत्नी को प्रसन्न करने की चेष्टा कर रहे थे। इसके लिये उन्होंने एक श्लोक के निम्नलिखित तीन चरण कहे -

गत प्राया रात्रिः शशिमुखि शशी शीर्यत हव
प्रदीपो यं निद्रावशमुपगतो धूर्णित हव।
प्रणामान्तो मानस्यजसि न तथापि कुघमहो

इस प्रकार तीन चरण कहकर चौथा चरण स्फुरित न होने से व्याकुल से हो रह थे। उस समय बाहर खड़े मयूर कवि ने कहा कुत्वप्रत्यासत्या हृदयमपि ते चण्डि कठिनम्। जब उनकी भगिनी बाण की पत्नी से यह सुना तो क्रुद्ध होकर उसे कुष्ठी हो जाने का शाप दे दिया जिसके त्राण पाने के लिए उन्होंने सूर्यशतक की रचना की और रोगनिर्मुक्त हो गये।

सद्यः परनिर्वृति अनुभवैक बेध है। अतः उसे दृष्टान्त से पुष्ट करने की आवश्यकता नहीं। कान्तासम्मित तमोपदेशयुजे में उन्होंने अन्य अ प्रमुसम्मित और मित्रसम्मित उपदेशों से रसांगभूत व्यापार प्रवणतया कहकर काव्योपदेश में व्यतिरेक स्थापन करते हुए रामादिवद्वर्तितव्यं न एवणादिवत् से समझाया कि काव्य द्वारा जो कृत्य में प्रवृत्ति और अकृतय से निवृत्ति के लिये प्रेरणा मिलती है वह अन्य विधि से प्राप्त प्रेरणा से कहीं अधिक कारगर होती है।

इन प्रयोजनों को सोपपत्तिक सदृष्टान्त पुष्ट करने का कार्य काव्य जगत् में आचार्य मम्मट ने ही किया।

फलस्वरूप - निर्धारण

प्रयोजनों के स्वरूपनिर्धारण में भी आचार्य ने अतितरसाधारण वैशिष्ट्य प्रकाशित किया है। काव्यप्रकाश की संकेत नामक टीका के रचयिता माणि चन्द्र ने इन प्रयोजनों को दो श्रेणियों में विभक्त किया है-तदापि दृष्टादृष्टत्वाद्द्विधा। काव्यप्रकाश के एक अन्य टीकाकार श्रीधर पण्डित ने अपनी टीका में व्यवहार ज्ञानरूपी प्रयोजन को स्वतंत्र प्रयोजन के रूप में स्वीकार नहीं किया है। उनके मत का एक अन्य टीकाकार चण्डीदास ने प्रबल शब्दों में खण्डन किया है। वे लिखते हैं-

ननु व्यवहारज्ञानमपि हिताहितज्ञानमेवेति पृथग्गणनं निष्फलमिति चेत्, सत्यक्,
नृपगुणादिविषयो व्यवहारः स्वरूपतः एवापादेयः, एवं व्यवहर्तव्यमिति...।

परवती आचार्यों में श्री छिानाथ ने मम्मट के कान्तासम्मित तयोपदेशयुजे के आशय को श्लोकबद्ध कर इस प्रकार उपस्थित किया है -

यद् वेदात्प्रभुसमिमतादधिगतं शब्दप्रधानान्विदं
यच्चार्थपुत्रणात्पुराणवचनादिष्टं सुहृत्सम्मितात्।
कान्तासम्मितर्या यथा सरसतामापाक काव्याश्रया
कर्तव्ये कुतुकी बुधो विरचितस्तस्मै स्पृहां कुर्महे॥

संक्षेप में पण्डितराज जगन्नाथ ने भी मम्मट-स्वीकृत काव्य प्रयोजनों को स्वीकार किया है। वे लिखते हैं- तत्र कीर्तिपरमाह्लादगुरुराज देवता प्रसाद्यनेकप्रयोजनकस्य काव्यस्य ...।

इस प्रकार इस सर्वेक्षण से इतना स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि मम्मट के काव्य प्रयोजन अधिक पूर्ण एवं परिष्कृत हैं। इनमें पूर्वाचारों द्वारा प्रतिपादित काव्य प्रयोजनों का समावेश भी है और मौलिक उद्भावना भी।

वामनपुराण में काव्यच्छटा

पुराणों को प्रायः नीरस ग्रन्थ समुदाय ही समझा जाता रहा है। सृष्टि की उत्पत्ति से लेकर देवी-देवताओं की कथाओं एवं भुवनकोषों का वर्णन इनमें पाया जाता है। ये निश्चय ही काव्य नहीं हैं। पर फिर भी युग के प्रतिनिधि साहित्य के रूप में इनमें साहित्यिक पुट अनजाने ही आ गया है। भारत के स्वर्णिम युग में जो काव्य-स्वर-लहरी इस देश में प्रवाहित हो रही थी, उसकी प्रतिध्वनि पुराणों में भी सुनाई दे जाती है। तीर्थस्थानों का वर्णन करते समय या अन्य अवसरों पर पुराणकार की रचना काव्यमय हो उठती है। भावनाओं के आवेश में सीधा-सादा पुराणकार कवि बन जाता है; उसकी कल्पना उड़ने लगती है; उत्प्रेक्षा मचल उठती है और तब बरबस फूट पड़ती है उसकी कविता।

पुराणों में ऐसे काव्य-स्थल कहाँ हैं और कितने हैं, यह स्वयं में एक सुन्दर शोध का विषय है। संभवतः पुराणों का साहित्यिक अध्ययन अभी सम्पन्न नहीं हुआ। पुराणों में स्थान-स्थान पर बिखरी हुई साहित्यिक सामग्री का संकलन एवं पूर्वापर काव्य-साहित्य से उसकी तुलना किसी भी शोध विद्यार्थी के जीवन का ध्येय बन सकता है। प्रस्तुत लेख में इस विशाल विषय के एक देश पर ही अंगुलिनिर्देश किया जा रहा है

'वामनपुराण' के प्रारम्भ में ही कुछ सुन्दर श्लोकों में पुण्य वाराणसी क्षेत्र का वर्णन है जहाँ इस पवित्र तीर्थ के महात्म्य का उल्लेख है वहीं इसके वैभव एवं सौन्दर्य का भी। किस प्रकार यहाँ की विलासिनियों की रशना में बँधी किकिणियों की रणरणाहट से वेदाभ्यासजड़ ब्राह्मणों के मन भी डोल जाते हैं और वे स्वर ठीक से उच्चारण नहीं कर पाते हैं, इसका अत्यन्त सरल एवं मनोहर वर्णन करने में पुराणकार ने कोई कोर-कसर नहीं उठा रखी है। शिष्यों का ध्यान भला ऐसी ध्वनि को सुन क्यों न कल्पना के जाल बुनने लगे? उनका ध्यान बरबस उधर खिंच जाता है और वे प्रमाद करने लगते हैं। वे प्रमाद करते जाते हैं और गुरुजन उन्हें सुधारते जाते हैं। इस दृश्य को देख पास से गुजरती हुई कामिनियाँ बार-बार हँस देती हैं :

विलासिनीनां रशनास्वनेन श्रुतिस्वरो ब्राह्मणपुंगवानाम्।

शुचिस्वरात्वं गुरवो निशम्य हास्यान्विताः सन्ति मुहुर्मुहुस्तः॥

इस श्लोक का अन्वय अतीत क्लिष्ट है। जितने वाक्य इसमें बन सकते हैं उन सब में अध्याहार करना पड़ता है। बिना उसके श्लोक के पद बेजोड़ एवं निरर्थक-से रह जाते हैं। अध्याहार करने पर श्लोक का अन्वय इस प्रकार बनता है—*विलासिनीयों रशनास्वनेन*

ब्राह्मणपुंगवानां श्रुतिस्वरः (दुष्टो भवति)। गुरवः (तत्र) शुचिस्वरत्वम् (उपदिशन्ति)। (तत्) निशम्य ता मुहुर्मुहुर्हस्यान्विता भवन्ति। तत् का इसमें अर्थ है तदुभयमपि उन दोनों को — ब्राह्मणों के प्रमाद को और गुरुजनों के संशोधन को।

वाराणसी की मस्त विलासिनियाँ जब महावर से पाँव रंग चौराहे से गुज़रती है तो स्वयं भगवान् निशानाथ भी अकचका जाते हैं और सोचने लगते हैं कि क्या यह स्थलपद्मिनी चली जा रही है।

व्रजत्सु योषित्सु चतुष्पथेषु पदान्यलक्तारुणितानि दृष्ट्वा।

ययौ शशी विस्मयमेव यस्यां किंस्वित्प्रयाता स्थलपद्मिनीयम्॥²

“रात में चन्द्रमा के उदित होते ही कमलिनियाँ बन्द हो जाती हैं तो फिर ये यहाँ कैसे? और हाँ, कमलिनियाँ तो जल में होती हैं, वाराणसी के चौराहों में तो नहीं! पर ठीक है, ये स्थलपद्मिनियाँ ही होंगी। चन्द्रमा कुछ सोच में पड़ जाते हैं।”

उपर्युक्त पद्य जैसे उत्प्रेक्षा अलंकार का उत्कृष्ट नमूना है वैसे ही उससे आगे का भ्रांतिमान् का। चन्द्रकान्त-मणिखचित दीवारों में जब ललनाओं के मुख-कमल प्रतिबिम्बित होते हैं तो, और तो और, भँवरे भी उन्हें सचमुच कमल समझ बैठते हैं और दूसरे फूलों की ओर ताकते तक भी नहीं :

भृंगाश्च यस्यां शशिकान्तभित्तौ प्रलोभ्यमानाः प्रतिबिम्बितेषु।

आलक्ष्य योषिद्विमलाननाब्जेष्वीयुर्ध्रमानैव च पुष्पकान्तरम्॥³

वाराणसी का विलासी नागरिक ऐसी अनिन्द्य सुन्दरियों के साथ जी भर का आँख मिचौनी खेलता है और शायद कुछ थक भी जाता है। पर गृहदीर्घिका में घुस कर जलकेल करते ही उसकी थकावट दूर हो जाती है। पहले सम्मोहन खेल में हार कर थकावट हुई भी तो क्या? जलक्रीड़ा से सारा श्रम दूर हो जाता है—

परिश्रमरचापि पराजितेषु नरेषु सम्मोहनखेलनेन।

यस्यां जलक्रीडनसंगतासु नस्त्रीषुशम्भो! गृहदीर्घिकासु॥⁴

वारवनिताओं का धनलोलपता तो प्रसिद्ध ही है। धूर्त विट आदि उन्हें सदैव घेरे रहते हैं। प्रसाधनादि द्वारा अपनी कांचनकाया को सजा कर छैल-छबीलों के मन को वे लुभाती हैं। वाराणसी अपनी वारविलासिनियों के लिये बहुत समय से प्रसिद्ध रही है। आज भी इसकी प्रसिद्धि है। ‘वामनपुराण’ में शंकर को संबोधन कर इनका वर्णन किया गया है। विशेषण ऐसे हैं जो श्लेष द्वारा विलासिनियों एवं भगवान् शंकर दोनों के पक्ष में समान रूप से घटते हैं। निम्नलिखित पद्य श्लेषात्मक काव्य-शैली का उत्कृष्ट नमूना है :

भूतिलुब्धा विलासिन्यो भुजंगपरिवारिताः।

चन्द्रभूषितदेहाश्च यस्यां त्वमिव शंकरा॥⁵

“हे शंकर! जिस (वाराणसी) में विलासिनियाँ पैसे की लोभी होती हैं, विटादि उन्हें घेरे रहते हैं, कपूर से उनकी काया अलंकृत रहती है, ठीक उसी तरह जैसे कि तुम्हें भस्म प्यारी होती है, साँपों से तुम घिरे रहते हो और चन्द्रमा तुम्हारे शरीर का आभूषण बना रहता है।

वाराणसी के वैभव का कहना ही क्या, वह ऐश्वर्य और विलास की नगरी है। वाराणसी न केवल सौन्दर्य एवं वैभव की नगरी ही है, अपितु सदाचार और शील की भी वह चिरपरिचित क्रीडास्थली रही है। कवि ने अपने हृदय की भावनाओं को इन श्लोकों में परिसंख्या एवं श्लेष द्वारा अभिव्यक्ति प्रदान करने का बहुत ही सफल प्रयास किया है :

पाशग्रन्थिर्गजेंद्राणां दानच्छेदो मदच्युतौ।

यस्यां मानमदौपुंसां करिणां यौवनागमो॥

प्रियदोषाः सदा यस्यां कौशिका नेतरे जनाः।

तारागणे कुलीनत्वं मेघे वृत्तच्युतिर्विभो॥⁶

“यदि कहीं फन्दे की गाँठ है तो वह हाथियों के लिये ही है, कैदियों के लिये नहीं। हाथियों की मस्ती जब दूर होती है तभी दानवारि बहना बन्द होता है, वैसे दान देने में रुकावट नहीं आती; जवानी आने पर यदि मान और मद होते हैं तो हाथियों में ही न कि लोगों में। इस वाराणसी में उल्लुओं को ही रात्रि (दोष) अच्छी लगती है, दूसरे लोगों की व्यसनो (दोष) में प्रसक्ति नहीं है। यहाँ पृथिवी में लीन न हो ना (अ+ कु + लीन + ता) है तो सही पर वह तारक-समूह में ही है। अन्यत्र कुलीनता का अभाव (अ+ कुलीनता) कहीं नहीं पाया जाता। गोल-गोल बूंदें यहाँ बादलों में ही हैं वृत्तच्युति (आचारभ्रंश) अन्यत्र कहीं नहीं पाया जाता।

न केवल इतना ही, वाराणसी के निवासी धर्मवत्सल हैं। वहाँ के गगनचुम्बी देवालय रात्रि के प्रारम्भ में ही चन्द्रमा की (चाँदनी को) रोक देते हैं। दिन में भी वे हवा में फहराती हुई अपनी लम्बी-लम्बी पताकाओं से सूर्य की किरणों को धाम लेते हैं—

तृणानि यस्या सुरमन्दिराणि रुन्धन्ति चन्द्रं रजनीमुखेषु।

दिवाऽपि सूर्यं पवनान्विताभिर्दोर्धाभिरेवं सुपताकिनाभिः॥⁷

जिस किसी ने भी वाराणसी के मन्दिर और उनका वैभव एक बार भी देख लिया हो उसे इस वर्णन में तनिक भी अतिशयोक्ति नहीं मालूम होगी।

वाराणसी वर्णनोपरान्त षष्ठ अध्याय में एक ऐसा स्थल आता है जहाँ वसन्त ऋतु का बहुत ही रमणीय वर्णन है। जैसे भाव हैं वैसे ही भाषा भी है। उपमा और रूपकों की तो झड़ी-सी लग गई है। प्रकरण है ऋषि, नर और नारायण का। उनकी कठोर तपस्या से भयभीत हुए इन्द्र उन्हें विचलित करने के लिये अप्सरा रम्भा को कामदेव और वसन्त के साथ बलविक्राश्रम में भेजते हैं। वसन्त को आश्रम में आते ही नई शोभा आ

जाती है। शिशिर ऋतु में आश्रम के वृक्ष तुषारमथित होने के कारण देखने में कुछ अच्छे नहीं लगते। पर ऋतुराज के पदार्पण के साथ उनमें नव-जीवन आ जाता है। चारों ओर सुषमा बिखरी-सी दीखती है। शिशिर का पराजय होता है और वसन्त की विजय होती है। वसन्त-रूपी सिंह शिशिर-रूपी हाथी को मानो पलाश-कुसुम-रूपी नाखूनों से चीर कर आश्रम भूमि में आता है। वह अपनी विजय पर गर्व अनुभव करता है और यह कह कर कि मैंने अपने तेज से शिशिर-रूपी हाथी को जीत लिया, शिशिर का मजाक उड़ाता है। उस समय कुन्द पुष्प के कोरकों के रूप में उसके दांत दिखाई दे जाते हैं। वसन्तश्री से कर्णिकार वृक्ष फूलों से लद जाते हैं और ऐसे शोभा पाने लगते हैं जैसे उन्होंने सोने के आभूषण पहिन रखे हों। उनके बगल में ही नीम के पेड़ नौकरों के समान ऐसे उपस्थिति दे रहे हैं जैसे कि राजा के द्वारा सम्मान पाये हुए राजपुत्र सेवक। लाल अशोक के बागों में अचानक चमक आ गई है और वे खिल उठे हैं। ऐसा जान पड़ता है कि वे महाराज वसन्त के सेवक हैं, जिससे युद्ध में रक्त बह चला है। घने जंगल में भौरों के झुण्ड विराजमान हैं, ठीक वैसे ही जैसे कि मित्र-समागम होने पर सज्जनों के शरीर पर रोमांचजाल प्रकट हो उठता है। बेंत के पौधों पर मंजरिया लग गई हैं और वे नदी के किनारों पर शोभा पाने लगे हैं। वे अपनी अंगुलियों से मानो यह कहना चाहते हैं कि कौन ऐसा वृक्ष है जो हमारी तुलना कर सकता है। तन्वंगी वसन्त लक्ष्मी का उस बदरिकाश्रम में पदार्पण हुआ है। उसका आकार भी कितना सुन्दर है। लाल अशोक हैं उसके हाथ। किशुक उसके पाँव हैं, वह एक हाथ में नीलाशोक का फूल लिये है। उस साँवरी का मुख है खिला कमल का फूल, नील कमल उसके नेत्र हैं, बिलव-फल स्तन हैं, खिले हुए कुन्द दाँत हैं और मंजरी उसके हाथ में शोभा पा रही है। उसका अधर है बन्धु जीव का फूल, नाखून हैं श्वेत सिन्दुवार के फूल। पुस्कोकिल की काकली है उसकी मधुर ध्वनि और वस्त्र हैं कंकोलपादप, मोरों के झुण्ड उसके आभूषण हैं और उसके नूपुरों की झनझनाहट है सासों का कलनाद। सामने का बाँस उसकी मेखला है और मदमस्त हंस की चाल के रूप में वह चलती है :

शिशिरं नाम मातङ्गं विदार्य नखरैरिव।

वसन्तकेसरी प्रातः पलाशकुसुमैर्वने॥

मया तुषारैश्च करी निर्जितः स्वेन तेजसा।

तमेवमहसल्लोभ्रैर्वसन्तः कुन्द कुड्मलैः॥

वनानि कर्णिकाराणां पुष्पितानि विरेजिरे।

यथा नरेन्द्रपत्राणि कनकाभरणानि वै॥

तेषामनु तथा नीपाः किंकरा इव रेजिरे।

स्वामिसल्लब्धसमाना भृत्या राजसुता इव॥

रक्ताशोकवना भान्ति पुष्पिताः सहसोज्ज्वलाः।

भृत्या वसन्तनृपतेः संगमासृक् क्षता इव।

भृंगं वृन्दाः पिंजरिता राजन्ते गहने वने।
 पुलकाभिवृता यद्वत् सज्जनाः सुहृदागमे॥
 मंजरीभिर्विराजन्ते नदीकूलेषु वेतसाः।
 वक्तुकामा इवांगुल्या कोऽस्माकं सदृशो नगः॥
 रक्ताशोक करा तन्वी देवर्षे किंशुकारकिता।
 नीलाशोककरा श्यामा विकासिकमलानना॥
 नीलेन्दीवर नेत्रा च ब्रह्मन् विल्वफलस्तनी।
 प्रोत्फुल्लकुन्ददशना मंजरीकरशोभिता॥
 बन्धुजीवाधरा शुभ्रसिन्दुवारानखांकुरा।
 पुंस्कोकिलस्वना दिव्या कंकोलवसना शुभा।
 बर्हिवृन्दकलापा च सारसस्वरनूपुरा।
 प्राग्वशंरसना ब्रह्मन् मतहंसगतिस्तथा।
 वसन्तलक्ष्मीः सम्प्राप्ता तस्मिन् बदरिकाश्रमे॥^४

वसन्त लक्ष्मी का ऐसा सरस एवं सजीव चित्र 'वामनपुराण' की मरुभूमि में चलते हुए किसी थके-मांदे बटोही को दिखाई दे जायगा, इसकी कल्पना भी न हो सकती थी। प्राचीन काल के प्रकृतिपुत्र के मानसपटल पर आस-पास के रमणीय दृश्यों की धुधली-सी रेखा कभी अंकित हुई होगी। उसने उसमें रंग भरना शुरू किया। चारों ओर वह वृक्ष-वनस्पतियों से घिरा था। उनसे इसका घनिष्ठ परिचय था। अस्पष्ट रेखा अब स्पष्ट हो गई। प्रकृतिपुत्र की कल्पना उड़ चली। उसने उन वृक्ष-वनस्पतियों की एक साकार मानवीय प्रतिमा तैयार की, उसमें प्राण प्रतिष्ठा की, उसके एक-एक अंग को सुन्दर से सुन्दर बनाया। कल्पना चरितार्थ हुई। एक मोहिनी मूर्ति के - वसन्तलक्ष्मी के दर्शन हो गये।

इस तरह की एक अन्य मोहिनी मूर्ति के दर्शन हमें माधव-उर्वशी-समागम के समय भी हो जाते हैं। यह मूर्ति काल्पनिक नहीं वास्तविक है। एक देवांगना की मोहिनी मूर्ति है यह। इसके प्रत्येक अंग से सौंदर्य छलक रहा है। आंख, नाक, कान, सभी में सुन्दरता अपनी परिपूर्णता पर पहुँची है। उसके पीन उरोज इस प्रकार सटे जा रहे हैं जैसे कि सत्पुरुष। क्या ही सुन्दर उपमा है! रोमराजी उसके जघनस्थल के कुचवट की ओर ऐसी चली गई है जैसे भैवरों की डार की डार पुलिन से तालाब की ओर जा रही हो। उसके अतिविस्तीर्ण जघनस्थल के चारों ओर भेखला पड़ी हुई है और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है मानो वह मन्दर पर्वत है जिसे साँपों ने जकड़ रखा हो।

राजतेऽस्याः कुचौ पीनी सज्जनाविवसंहतौ।
 रोमावली च जघनाद्याति स्तनतटद्वयम्।
 राजते भोग्यालव पुलिनात्कमलाकरम्।

जघनं त्वत्तिविस्तीर्णं भात्यस्या रसनावृतम्।

क्षीरोदमथनं नद्ध भुजगेनवे मन्दरम्॥⁹

उसके रूप के विषय में अधिक क्या कहा जाय। बिना महावर रँग भी उसके पाँव महावर रँग-से प्रतीत होते हैं (पादा-वलक्तकसमत्विषौ)। वह सचमुच कमल -केसर के समान है (पद्मकिञ्जल्कसन्निभा)। इसमें आश्चर्य ही क्या है कि ऐसी सौन्दर्य प्रतिभा की देख माधव जी सोच में पड़ गये-

माधवो ह्यर्वशीं दृष्ट्वा चिन्तयति नारद।

किंस्वित्कामनरेन्द्रस्य राजाधानी स्वयस्थिता॥

अज्ञाता शशिनो नूनमियं कान्तिर्निशाक्षये।

रविरश्मिप्रतापार्ति भीता शरणमागता॥¹⁰

"क्या यह साक्षात् महाराज कामदेव की राजधानी (मेरे सामने) खड़ी है? ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि यह चन्द्रमा की कान्ति है पर उसका इससे पूर्वपरिचय नहीं है; सम्भवतः यह सूर्य की प्रखर किरणों की पीड़ा से डर कर (मेरी) शरण में आ गई है। माधव कुछ क्षणों के लिये ध्यानमग्न हो जाते हैं। तब उस अनिद्य सुन्दरी के बारे में वे सब कुछ जान लेते हैं, वे विहँस देते हैं। अरे यह तो मेरे ऊरुजों से उत्पन्न हुई उर्वशी है।"

'वामनपुराण' में न केवलशृंगार रस में ही कवि ने प्रौढ़ि प्रदर्शित की है अपितु रौद्र और वीभत्स रस के वर्णन में भी उनकी अनितरसाधारणी प्रतिभा पदे-पदे अवभासित होती है। नवम अध्याय में देव-दानव-संग्राम का वर्णन कवि की क्रांत दर्शिता का एक उत्कृष्ट उदाहरण है। पहले तो कवि सामान्य ढंग से युद्ध की भीषणता का वर्णन करता है। जब देव-दानव सेनाओं की मुठभेड़ हुई तो भयंकर दृश्य समुपस्थित हो गया। तुमुल युद्ध होने लगा (तुमुलः सुकुलोऽतिभयंकरः)। चारों ओर धूल उड़ने लगी और दिशाएँ धूलिधूसरित हो गई। पिता पुत्र को नहीं पहचान पाता था और पुत्र पिता को नहीं। भूल से सैनिक निजपक्षीय सैनिकों को ही मारने लगे। चारों ओर मार-काट मच गई। हाथी पर हाथी, सवार पर सवार और पदाति पर पदाति गिरने लगा। रक्त की एक नदी-सी बह चली।

इस सामान्य वर्णन से भला कवि की काव्य-प्रतिभा कैसे सन्तोष पा सकती थी? उसने रूपक अलंकार का आश्रय लिया। संग्राम भूमि में प्रवाहित होने वाला रक्त नदी का जल बन गया, रथ भँवर बन गये और योद्धा चट्टाने बन गये, जिनसे टकरा कर वह नदी आगे बढ़ने लगी। कवि ने अब युद्ध-भूमि की अन्य चीजों की ओर भी एक दृष्टि डाली, यह जानने के लिये कि कौन-कौनसी चीजे उस नदी में पूर्णता ला सकेंगी। उसे वे चीजे मिल गई है। उसने उन सब चीजों को नदी में पाई जाने वाली चीजों के रूप में देखा। खून के दरिया में आंतों ने शैवाल का काम किया, पताकाएँ फेन बन गई। उस नदी में हाथियों की कनपट्टियाँ ही बड़े-बड़े कछुए, बाण मीन, नुकीले भाले

मगरमच्छ और बड़ी-बड़ी तलवारें घड़ियाल आदि जलजन्तु थे। वह पिशाचों और मुनियों से भरी थी। साधारण लोग उसको पार करने का साहस नहीं कर सकते के रूप में थे (दुस्तरा प्रकृतैर्जनैः)। केवल शूरवीर ही उसे रथरूपी नौकाओं से पार कर पा रहे थे

ततस्तु संकुले तस्मिन् युद्धे देवासुरे मुने।
प्रावर्तत नदी घोरा शमयन्ती रणे रजः॥

असृक्ताया रथावर्ता योधसघट्टवाहिनी।
गजकुम्भमहाकूर्मा शरमीना दुरत्यया।

तीव्राप्रातमकरा महासिन्धुवाहिनी।
अन्त्रशैवालसंकीर्णा पताकाफेन मालिनी।

गृध्रकंकमहाहंसा श्येनचक्रहमण्डिता।
पिशावमुनिसंकीर्णा दुस्तरा प्रकृतैर्जनैः॥¹¹

युद्धभूमि का नदी के रूप में अथवा समुद्र के रूप में वर्णन साहित्य में अन्यत्र भी देखने को मिलता है। 'रामायण' में भी एक स्थल पर ऐसा ही वर्णन आता है।

हतवीरौघवप्रां तु भग्नायुधमहाद्रुमा।
शोणितौघमहातोया यमसागरगामिनीम्॥
यकृत्प्लीहमहापकां विनिकीर्णान्त्रशैवला।
भिन्नकायशिरौमीनामगावयशाद्वला।
गृध्रहंसवराकीर्णा कंकसारससेविता।
मेदःफेनसमाकीर्णामिवर्तस्वननिः स्वनाम्॥
तां कापुरुषदुस्तरां युद्धभूमिमयीं नदीम्।
राक्षसा कपिमुख्यास्ते तैरुस्ता दुस्तरां नदीम्॥¹²

“उन कवि पुरोगम राक्षसों ने उस दुस्तर नदी को पार किया जिसके किनारे पर मरे हुए वीरों के ढेर के रेत के टीले थे, टूटे हुए शस्त्र बड़े-बड़े वृक्ष थे और रक्तप्रवाह ही जलातिशय था। वह नदी यम रूपी समुद्र की ओर चली जा रही थी। यकृत और प्लीह उसका पंक था, विखरी हुई आंते काई थी, खण्डित हुए शरीर व शिर मत्स्य थे और अंग ही हरे-भरे प्रदेश थे। गीधों के रूप में वह उत्तम हंसों से घिरी थी और कंक नामक पक्षियों के रूप में उसमें सारस थे। वपारूपी फेन से वह भरी थी। भँवर के शब्द के अतिरिक्त उसमें कोई शब्द न था।

‘योगवासिष्ठ’ में भी युद्धभूमि को नदी का रूप दिया गया है :

असृङ्गनदी वहद्वरि कटकपटनोपगम्।
रक्तत्रातः स्फुरच्छक्लवस्त्रडिण्डोरेपिण्डकम्॥¹³

“युद्धभूमि रक्त की नदी है, बहते हुए हाथियों की कनपट्टियाँ इसमें पालवाली किशितयाँ

हैं, रक्त के बहाव में प्रकट होते हुए शुक्लवस्त्र फेन-पिण्ड हैं, भाले प्रवाहित होती हुई रक्त नदी के तीर पर के ऊँचे वृक्ष हैं।''

उपरिनिर्दिष्ट कतिपय उदाहरणों से यह पूर्णरूपेण स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि 'रामायण', 'योगवासिष्ठ' एवं अन्य ग्रन्थों में भी युद्धभूमि को नदी का रूप दिया गया है। रूपकों में न्यूनाधिक भेद तो होता ही है। इसलिये 'वामनपुराण' के रचयिता द्वारा युद्धभूमि का नदी रूप में वर्णन भी भारतीय कवि की परम्परा के अनुरूप ही है।

'वामनपुराण' की काव्यच्छटा एक अन्य स्थल पर भी परिस्फुट हो उठती है। जब शिवजी पार्वती से विवाह करने के लिये हिमालय की नगरी में जाते हैं तो वर को देखने के कुतूहल से पौरस्त्रियाँ जो -जो विचित्र चेष्टाएँ करती हैं उसका वर्णन बहुत ही सुन्दर बन पड़ा है। जब पौरवधुओं को पता चलता है कि शिवजी आ रहे हैं तो वे अपना सब काम छोड़ उन्हें देखने को दौड़ पड़ती हैं। उनमें से एक जो चोटी गूँधने को होती है एक हाथ में मोतियों की माला लिये और दूसरे हाथ में केश थामे शंकर की ओर चल देती है। दूसरी की आँखों बचैन हो उठती है और वह बहुत-सा महावर एक ही पांव पर उंडेल कर और दूसरा पांव बिना रँगें ही चल देती है। तीसरी एक आंख में अंजन लगा कर दूसरी आंख में लगाने के लिये तैयार सलाई हाथ में लिये भाग लेती है। चौथी मेखला और वस्त्र को हाथ में लेकर पागलों की तरह नंगी ही दौड़ पड़ती है। पांचवीं तो धीमे-धीमे कदम रखती हुई ज्यों ही गवाक्ष तक पहुँचती है त्यों ही यह सुन कर कि दूल्हा तो चला गया अपने पयोधरविस्तारित यौवन को उलाहना देने लगती है—

माल्यदाम समादाय करणैकेन भामिनी।

केशपाशं द्वितीयेन शंकराभिमुखी गता॥

अन्याऽलक्तकरागाढयं पादं कृत्वाऽऽकुलेक्षणा॥

अनलक्तकमेकं हि हरं द्रष्टुमुपागता॥

एकेनाक्ष्णाञ्जितेनैव श्रुत्वा भीममुपागतम्

सांजनां च प्रगृहयान्या शलाकां सुष्ठु धावति॥

अन्य सरशनं वासः पाणिनादाय सुन्दरी

उन्मत्तेवागमन्गना हरदर्शनलालसा॥

अन्यातिक्रांतमीशानं श्रुत्वा स्तनभरालसा॥

अनिन्दत कुचौ वाला यौवनं सर्वं कृशोदरी॥¹⁴

महाकवि कालिदास कृत 'रघुवंश' एवं 'कुमारसम्भव' में भी जब महाराज अज इन्दुमती के भाई की राजधानी में आते हैं तो वीरागंनाओं की बहुत कुछ वही हालत होती है जैसे कि 'वामनपुराण' में वर्णन की गई है —

आलोकमार्ग सहता व्रजन्त्या कयाचिदुद्वेष्टनवान्तमाल्यः।

बद्धं न सम्भावित एव तावत्करणे रुद्धोऽपि च केशपाशः॥

विलोचनं दक्षिणमञ्जनेन सम्भाव्यतदायवामनेत्रा।
तथैव वातायनसान्निर्कषं ययीशिलाकामपरा वहन्ती॥

प्रसाधिकालाम्बितमग्रपादमाक्षिप्य काचिद्वरागमेव।
उत्सृष्टलीलागतिरागवाक्षादलक्तकाकां पदवीं ततान॥¹⁵

कुमारसम्भव में भी जब शिवजी पार्वती के साथ विवाह करने के लिये आते हैं तो ऐसा ही सुन्दर वर्णन है।

वामनपुराण में विशेष काव्यस्थलों के अतिरिक्त स्थान-स्थान पर अनेकानेक सुन्दर उपमाएँ भी पाई जाती हैं। काव्यच्छटा भले ही ऐसे श्लोकों में न हो पर काव्य तो उन्हें कहा ही जायगा। जहाँ भी रस रहेगा वहाँ काव्यत्व रहेगा। रस उन श्लोकों में भी मिलता है, इसलिये वे भी काव्य हैं। 'विच्छित्तिविशेष' तो कतिपय स्थलों में ही मिलता है। इसलिये काव्यच्छटा कहीं-कहीं ही दिखाई पड़ती है।

सन्दर्भ ग्रन्थ सूची

1. श्लोक में प्राग्वश का अर्थ अस्पष्ट है। कोषों में इसके अर्थ वेदी की सामने की भूमि एवं पहली पीढ़ी दिये हैं। दोनों ही यहाँ नहीं घटते। यदि वंश का अर्थ बांस लिया जाय तो प्राक् निरर्थक रह जाता है। इस पद का ठीक अर्थ क्या होना चाहिए यह एक समस्या है।
1. 1. 3.31
2. 3.32
3. 3.34
4. 3.35
5. 3.39
6. 3.37-38
7. 3.33
8. 6.10-21
- 9.
10. 7.14-15
11. 9.36-39
12. vi., 58.29-33.
14. 5.3-28
15. रघु. 7.6-68।

YASH PUBLICATIONS

1/10753, Street No. 3, St
Naveen Shahdara, I